

PORTO RICO.

George P. De Pass to be postmaster at Mayaguez, P. R., in place of Fred Leser, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1914.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Parler to be postmaster at Elloree, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

TEXAS.

Hattie M. Culpepper to be postmaster at Palmer, Tex., in place of C. E. Culpepper, deceased.

Alex Dienst to be postmaster at Temple, Tex., in place of Thomas J. Darling. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1914.

James C. Gose to be postmaster at Krum, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

R. E. Rankin to be postmaster at Abilene, Tex., in place of Turner S. Rollins. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1914.

R. A. St. John to be postmaster at Cisco, Tex., in place of Gomer S. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1914.

VIRGINIA.

Boyd Boggess to be postmaster at Richlands, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Carroll C. Chowning to be postmaster at Urbanna, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Charles C. King to be postmaster at Pearisburg, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Leslie N. Ligon to be postmaster at Pamplin, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

William G. Stevenson to be postmaster at Accomac, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

WISCONSIN.

K. W. Baker to be postmaster at Greenwood, Wis., in place of Henry H. Hartson. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1914.

T. L. Cleary to be postmaster at Platteville, Wis., in place of Benjamin Webster. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1914.

A. H. Craig to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of Charles E. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

F. J. Egan to be postmaster at Muscoda, Wis., in place of A. C. Vandewater Elston, deceased.

Frank J. Haas to be postmaster at Richland Center, Wis., in place of Martin Copenhefer. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1914.

Frank Heiderer to be postmaster at Butternut, Wis., in place of John J. Hayden. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

James McEntee to be postmaster at De Forest, Wis., in place of John A. Rasmussen. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Francis H. Metcalf to be postmaster at Reedsburg, Wis., in place of Howard B. Quimby. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1912.

Charles T. O'Brien to be postmaster at Necedah, Wis., in place of James H. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1914.

Thomas F. Powers to be postmaster at Mauston, Wis., in place of Judson L. Marvin. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1914.

CONSULS GENERAL.

Henry W. Diederich to be consul general at Barcelona, Spain.
Carl Bailey Hurst to be consul general at Antwerp, Belgium.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, October 20, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee for Thy goodness and for Thy wonderful works to the children of men. Help us as individuals to appreciate the opportunities spread out before us for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of our being, and teach us to know as integral parts of a great Republic in unity there is strength, in discord weak-

ness, that we may grow the spirit of fraternity unto the unity of the faith in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] called up two conference reports, which were agreed to. As a matter of fact, no conference report had been made to the House at all, and in this case I suggest to the gentleman that he ask to have that stricken out of the Record or move to reconsider the votes and present the conference reports. I think there is no objection to a unanimous-consent request to consider them immediately.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which the conference reports were agreed to on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that these orders of yesterday be vacated and stricken from the Journal. That will settle it.

Mr. POU. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. What are the numbers of the bills?

Mr. POU. The first is H. R. 1055, and the next is H. R. 4405.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the proceedings in reference to these two bills, the numbers of which he has given, be vacated and the entry as to them stricken from the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POU. Now, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the Journal be approved.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution ceding to the State of California temporary jurisdiction over certain lands in the Presidio of San Francisco and Fort Mason (Cal.) Military Reservations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they have presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolutions:

H. R. 14233. An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12665. An act to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo.;

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to correct an error in the enrollment of certain Indians enumerated in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, enacted into law in the Indian appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution for the appointment of five members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report (No. 1193). By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I report back to the House the bill H. R. 18891, the revenue bill, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the House disagree to all of the Senate amendments on this bill and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 18891. An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reports back to the House this bill with the recommendation that the Senate amendments be disagreed to and the conference asked for by the Senate agreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I do not object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that a Senate amendment proposes to increase the duty on beer to \$1.75 a barrel from \$1.50 as proposed by the House. I wish to

say for the benefit, not of the gentleman from Alabama but of some other persons, that so far as I am concerned and some others on this side of the House who feel like myself, I shall not vote for a conference report that fixes the duty on beer at the rate of \$1.75 a barrel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair announces the following conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KITCHIN, and Mr. PAYNE.

FREDERICK J. ERNST.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the bill H. R. 4405 be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should present it first to the House.

Mr. POU. I understood that had been done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina presents a conference report on the bill H. R. 4405, and asks its immediate consideration. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4405. An act for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst.

The conference report and statement were read, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 1197).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

EDWD. W. POU,

H. D. STEVENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

N. P. BRYAN,

FRANK S. WHITE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

T. S. WILLIAMS.

Mr. POU. Now, Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill H. R. 1055 and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of T. S. Williams.

The conference report and statement were read, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 1198).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of T. S. Williams, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

EDWD. W. POU,

H. D. STEVENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

N. P. BRYAN,

BLAIR LEE,

G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6282) for printing in the Record under the rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I rose to make a request for unanimous consent when this matter is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 6282. An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax on all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if this report has already been printed in the Record?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I am asking that the conference report and statement be printed in the Record under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The conference report and statement will be printed in the Record under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 1196).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "October," inserted by said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the word "March"; and on page 1 of the bill, line 4, strike out the word "fourteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "obliged" in the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "required"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "States," insert the following: "to any person in any foreign country"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "territorial," insert a comma; and in line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Navy" and the comma, insert the following: "the Public Health Service" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "interest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "intent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "veterinarian," insert the following: "required to register under the terms of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "one-fourth" and insert in lieu thereof "one-eighth"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,
CORDELL HULL,
J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. M. SIMMONS,
JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
C. S. THOMAS,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides for the date of effectiveness of this act, and the House recedes with an amendment fixing March 1, 1915, as the date the act shall go into effect in lieu of October 1, 1914. This change in date is necessary, for before the act can take effect provision must be made for registering and issuing official order blanks to at least 250,000 manufacturers, dealers, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment permits officers of the United States, the States, the Territories, the insular possessions, and the District of Columbia lawfully engaged in making purchases of the specified habit-forming drugs to do so without registering and without paying the special tax, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The act requires the registration of every person producing, manufacturing, selling, giving away, or dispensing any of these specified habit-forming drugs, and then excepts certain officers of the Federal and State Governments. This amendment therefore becomes necessary in order to obviate any question of the right of these officers to dispense or give away the drugs which they purchase without registering, and the House recedes with an amendment, changing the word "obliged" to "required."

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 35 are either changes in language making the phraseology of the act more clear and certain or correcting clerical errors, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment as redrafted does not require the personal attention of a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon to dispense or distribute any of the aforesaid narcotics, but, in case there is not personal attention on the part of the physician, dentist, or veterinarian, a record showing the amount of the drug dispensed or distributed, the date, the name, and the address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed must be kept for a period of two years, subject to inspection by the officers, agents, and employees of the Treasury Department and to the State, Territorial, District, municipal, and insular officials named in this act. Physicians, dentists, and veterinary surgeons will not have to keep a record of the quantity of the drug administered, etc., when in personal attendance upon their patients.

Amendment No. 10: Section 8 of this bill makes it unlawful for any person not registered under the provisions of this act to have in his possession or under his control any of the habit-forming drugs specified in this act, but exempts employees of registered persons acting in the scope of their employment and nurses acting under the supervision of a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon. As nurses are often employed by the patient, in order to prevent a nurse employed by a patient having possession of the aforementioned drugs from becoming liable to the penalty for violation of this act it therefore is necessary for the physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon to register under this act, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This amendment is to make it clear that it will be lawful for manufacturers and dealers to sell to the specified public officers without the official order blank. This amendment becomes necessary because previous amendments have exempted these officers from the necessity of registering and obtaining official order blanks. The House recedes with an

amendment specifying among the exempted class of officers those of the Public Health Service.

Amendment No. 17: This amendment becomes necessary because in the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and the Canal Zone the United States internal-revenue laws do not apply and there are no Federal internal-revenue districts or collectors. Neither are there any United States district courts in the Philippines. This amendment merely bestows jurisdiction in the Philippine Islands on the local courts and gives the President authority to issue such Executive orders as are deemed necessary to carry into effect the intent and purpose of this act, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment merely extends the exemption from liability under this act to persons delivering any of the aforementioned drugs prescribed or dispensed by a physician, dentist, or veterinarian, and to United States, county, municipal, District, Territorial, or insular officers or officials acting within the scope of their official duties, and the House recedes with an amendment requiring the physician, dentist, or veterinarian to register under the terms of this act.

Amendment No. 29: The House bill limited the amount of heroin that could be sold, distributed, given away, or dispensed without coming within the terms of this act to one-twelfth of a grain. The Senate increased the amount to one-fourth of a grain, and the House recedes with an amendment limiting the amount to one-eighth of a grain.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment exempts nurses working under the supervision of physicians, dentists, or veterinary surgeons registered under the act from the provisions of the act. This provision becomes necessary because the nurse is generally employed by the patient, and is therefore not an employee of a person registered under the act, and the House recedes.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,
CORDELL HULL,
J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It was agreed by the House that on the next day, barring Calendar Wednesday and unanimous-consent day, after the Philippine bill was through should be given to the consideration of the District of Columbia business. Now, the Philippine bill was finished on Wednesday last, but by unanimous consent Calendar Wednesday was set forward to Thursday; and in that way the next day, Thursday, was not given to the consideration of District business. The next day thereafter was Friday, and that was consumed by preferential business before District business was reached. The next day being Saturday, there was no session; and the next day was yesterday, which was unanimous-consent day, to which the District day, under the rule, had to give way again. I now inquire whether or not this is not District day under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore reached?

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair, without examining the Record, that that agreement was entered into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It was. There was no question about that. The question now is whether or not this day is the next day after the conclusion of the Philippine bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MANN. What became of Friday?

The SPEAKER. Friday was consumed by oratory, under the unanimous-consent agreement, and the Chair thinks it is true under the rules and regulations and the rules of common sense that this is really the first legislative day after getting through with the Philippine bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of House joint resolution 331 and such other matters as may come up.

LOUGHLIN F. MAGINN.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. LOBECK. I rise for the purpose of offering a resolution correcting a name in a pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] withhold his motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I withhold the motion for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 375) correcting an error in H. R. 15692, approved July 21, 1914 (Private, No. 95).

Whereas by an error occurring in the bill reported by the House Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 15692, approved July 21, 1914 [Private, No. 95], the name of one Loughlin F. Maginn, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read Loughlin F. Maginn of said regiment: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the paragraph in an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved July 21, 1914 (Private, No. 95, 63d Cong.), granting an increase of pension to one Jennie L. Maginn, be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Jennie L. Maginn, widow of Loughlin F. Maginn, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the business that was in order on yesterday may be in order to-day, and I am in hopes that in a few days we can reach an adjournment. I think by making the business in order to-day that was in order yesterday we can expedite business that is on the calendar and ought to be enacted, and it is not business that would seriously interfere with the adjournment in any way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the business that was in order yesterday shall be in order to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] advises me that he desires to bring in a rule to-morrow, and I couple with the request that business that is in order on Calendar Wednesday may go over until Thursday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the rule about?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what this rule is. Is it in regard to the cotton-warehouse bill?

Mr. HENRY. Yes. The rule is in regard to the Senate bill amending the Federal reserve act and the Aldrich-Vreeland bill and the Lever bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the business that was in order yesterday—that is, unanimous consent and the suspension of the rules—shall be in order to-day, and that business of Calendar Wednesday be postponed until Thursday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask, after consulting gentlemen who are interested in the matter, that business that is in order on to-morrow be in order on to-morrow week. In other words, that Calendar Wednesday go over a week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the business that was in order yesterday on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and under suspension of the rules be in order to-day, and, further, that the business of to-morrow be postponed a week.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama when he expects that Congress will adjourn?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will probably adjourn before to-morrow week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the latter part of the request does not amount to anything except to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the reason for that is in order to obviate the objection on the part of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] to the first part of the request?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman did not couple it in that way, but I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Rules has agreed to a rule which the gentleman from Texas desires to present, and if it was not presented to-morrow it would be presented on Thursday, as the Rules Committee has the right of way. I think it would expedite business to let it be presented to-morrow while the conferees are working on the revenue bill.

Mr. MANN. Would it not expedite business to have it presented to-day, so that we can dispose of it? There are a number of Republicans asking if they will have to return in order to make a quorum; and we are staying here now because of the cotton situation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have no objection to the rule being presented to-day and

unanimous-consent day being to-morrow. It was merely for the purpose of helping some Members get through certain bills that they want to get through.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that would be better. So far as I am concerned, if there is a chance to escape our present imprisonment and vote to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow—

Mr. HENRY. This will help the adjournment. It is just as broad as it is long. There are other matters that ought to come up. This Plaza-award proposition, it seems to me, ought to come up, and some other matters, and it would take just as much time to work it one way as the other; and the preference of the Committee on Rules is to present these rules to-morrow and get through with them to-morrow if we can obviate the proceedings under Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. But why should we not proceed to-day with these rules? We will have no objection, so far as I know.

Mr. HENRY. I would prefer to let the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] go ahead to-day, and if he gets through, then we will go on.

Mr. MANN. If he gets through to-day, you can go on to-day. Mr. HARDWICK. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. He can not get through to-day if this request goes through.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let us modify the form of the request.

Mr. MANN. Why not proceed regularly now, and to-morrow dispense with Calendar Wednesday and take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar to-morrow? It seems to me that it is desirable to know "where we are at" on this other situation. The sooner we do the sooner we will get away.

Mr. HENRY. If you obviate the proceedings of Calendar Wednesday we will get away just as quickly, because these rules will be presented to-morrow, and we will get through with those matters. Personally I would prefer to present the rules to-morrow. I would like to have copies made and give them to Members, so that they can see what we can agree on.

Mr. MANN. I can not see a prospect of daylight until we have a vote on that proposition.

Mr. HENRY. What is that?

Mr. MANN. I do not see any chance of daylight or a prospect of getting away until we have a vote on that proposition.

Mr. HENRY. Let the gentleman from Kentucky get up his bill.

Mr. MANN. That probably will not take very long.

Mr. HENRY. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering House joint resolution 331—and other District legislation, I was about to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. What is the purpose of that?

Mr. HARDWICK. As soon as we get through with that business we can go on with the rule.

Mr. MANN. I thought to-morrow we would take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar. If we have a quorum, I am willing to stay here to-night and finish your bills, or, if you do not get through to-night, to go ahead to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate matters, I would like to be given unanimous consent for the purpose of having the rules suspended for the purpose of taking up the former bill. That would give you the rest of the time.

Mr. MANN. Let us fix a time for debate. It will not take much time on the gentleman's motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I propose 10 or 15 minutes to a side. It will not make any difference to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Some gentlemen desire to be heard on our side. I do not know how much time it will take.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky will permit me, this resolution was before the House before, and at that time the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], representing his side of the question, spoke for more than an hour. I think he spoke about an hour and a half, and this side has not been heard at all, practically.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is mistaken, because the gentleman himself spoke longer than I did.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] spoke about 30 minutes. He had an hour left, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] spoke about an hour and 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] had 49 minutes left, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] had 15 minutes left.

Mr. MANN. The day the former resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky was up we had practically finished general debate. There was an agreement to close general debate, and I was to have 15 minutes out of the 20 that remained. That was on the first resolution. Now, I am willing to yield that under the circumstances. Then a second resolution came up.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, I understand now that the gentleman from Kentucky is changing his proposition, and wants to make a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. MANN. No; he is not making that motion.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; he is. If that is done, it cuts out our opportunity to offer any substitute.

Mr. MANN. Let us agree upon a time for debate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We will rest it on our 49 minutes and on their 15.

Mr. STAFFORD. Cut it down to half an hour on one side and 10 minutes on the other.

Mr. MANN. There is no reason why we should not stay here to-night if there is any occasion for it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say if it is to come up under suspension of the rules, without any opportunity for us to offer our substitute, we do not care to discuss it at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To offer a suggestion in the interest of the expedition of this business. If it is to be a matter of unanimous consent, it is not necessary that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] should ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to suspend the rules. The gentleman from Kentucky could ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. He does not want to suspend the rules. It takes a two-thirds vote to pass the bill under suspension of the rules. He is taking it up by unanimous consent, anyway.

Mr. MANN. It is in order. He has made his motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Let us fix the time for debate on that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It would not be in order, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Yes; the Chair has held it in order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then, Mr. Speaker, we are willing that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of this resolution, and to take 30 minutes on our side and 10 minutes to be given to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER. How much on the gentleman's side?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Thirty minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole, that he shall have 30 minutes' time to his side and that the gentleman from Kentucky shall have 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Plaza bill and other business from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Only the Plaza bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is all.

The SPEAKER. For the further consideration of the Plaza bill.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. About what?

Mr. KINDEL. On the subject of the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the state of the Union. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] objects.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the cotton situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the cotton situation. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] can not have that courtesy extended to him, no one else can. I object. I do not think it very gracious of the gentleman's colleague to object, when similar courtesies have been extended to him.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. What became of my request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objected, and that is the end of it.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oregon rise?

Mr. SINNOTT. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of representative government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of representative government. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] heard that request?

Mr. MANN. I did.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman intend to object?

Mr. MANN. I do not think I will, although if it was on that side of the House I would. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Let it be all or none.

PLAZA AWARDS.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 331) relating to the awards and payments thereon in what are commonly known as the Plaza cases, with Mr. WINGO in the chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, when this matter was under discussion before, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which had had this matter under consideration, I argued and reasoned and believed that the matter of acquiring a part of this property and not all of it was not good business and in the interest of the Government. I still hold to that opinion, and believe that it is the best business policy to acquire all of this property for the park as soon as we possibly can, without crippling our resources. But since that time different conditions have arisen. We are now passing a war-revenue measure to get money. The sum of \$600,000 is involved in this matter, and if the payment of that can be delayed, I think it is in the interest of economy and in the interest of good government to delay the expenditure for a park which is not a necessity until the time comes when we can easily make this payment out of the Government funds without impairing the finances of the Government. I simply want to make this statement so that my position may be perfectly understood. I have not changed my ideas or my arguments. There is but very little difference between the report of our committee and the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] to value this property, but I do feel that at this time a saving of the expenditure of \$600,000 is of value to the Government. [Applause.]

We should pay the small property owners the amount of their awards, as the President and the commission have decided that these awards are fair and just, but as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad are disposed to violate their former agreement to take the original price for their property, with 6 per cent interest added, I am in favor of letting them await the pleasure of this body and of saving this expenditure at this time.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, we have 30 minutes on our side, and I ask to be notified when I have used 10 minutes.

Our side desire to offer a substitute, and I want to ask if that will be in order now?

Mr. MANN. Not until the joint resolution is read.

The CHAIRMAN. We are proceeding with the general debate now. The substitute will be in order when the joint resolution is read for amendment.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been thrashed over upon two different occasions prior to this time. There is quite a difference between the resolution that was offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and the resolution offered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. That difference consists in this, that the resolution offered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds contemplates the ultimate acquisition of all of this ground which, in 1910, Congress declared its intention to take for the extension of the Capitol Grounds. In other words, the resolution that we propose to offer provides ultimately for the condemnation of the lands which are owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. and the Baltimore Investment Co., all of that land practically belonging to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has included in his resolution a stipulation that the commission, which the resolution provides the President shall appoint, shall take over the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.'s holdings at their original cost, with 6 per cent up to the time of the confirmation of the condemnation proceedings that was had on the 27th of February, 1913. I think that proposition is a preposterous one, for this reason: Here is the great Government of the United States attempting to take private property for a public purpose. We are saying to the private owner of that property, "We propose to give you the original cost of that property and 6 per cent up to a certain date." We are not putting the property of the Baltimore & Ohio Corporation upon a par with that owned by individuals. The just and equitable method is pointed out or provided in the resolution which we propose to offer as a substitute; that is, that the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia shall impanel a jury and let that jury assess the value of this property.

It is said by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON], who just preceded me, that owing to the fact that we are about to pass a war-revenue measure we should not include in this the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad holdings. For my part, I do not think that should cut any figure in this transaction. I do not think it is a business proposition for the Government to take isolated pieces of property, a piece of property here and a piece of property there, which destroys the very purpose for which the appropriation is sought to be made. The object of this scheme originally was to use all of this ground as a whole for the extension and enlargement and beautifying of the Capitol Grounds here. To take one piece of property here and another there would not accomplish anything, and what the Government would do with isolated pieces of property I do not know. In addition to that, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., when the proceedings in condemnation were dismissed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, filed a motion to set that judgment of dismissal aside, and in all probability will prosecute its contention to the United States Supreme Court, and the resolution offered by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee will be delayed, with the exception of the payment to private property owners. I say that the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is anomalous, because he bases it on a false premise. He bases his position upon the fact, as he says, that Mr. Hamilton, who is the local attorney here of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., in the year 1902 offered to take the original cost of this property, with 6 per cent interest. Nineteen hundred and two is 12 years ago, and to undertake to hold the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to a proposition of that kind, even conceding that they made such a proposition, to my mind is monstrous.

The facts in the case are these: Long prior to the year 1901 it was agitated in Congress and it was agitated here in the District of Columbia that all of the railroads entering the city of Washington should obliterate their grade crossings, and that culminated, I believe, in 1901 in Congress passing an act requiring the Southern Railroad Co., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to obliterate their grade crossings. That act provided that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. should move its station, which was situated on block 632, down here beyond the Maltz Building, from that place to a point opposite where the Senate Office Building now stands. In view of the agitation, and in view of that act of Congress in 1901 compelling it to move its station, compelling it to obliterate its grade crossings, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. acquired the remainder of this property, and was contemplating doing what Congress had compelled it to do by its legislation, namely, moving its station there, elevating its tracks above the street, when in 1903 Congress passed another act repealing

that act and establishing the Union Station where it now stands. The result of that legislation was to leave all of this property, after the streets had been raised, on the hands of the Baltimore & Ohio Co. absolutely as unproductive property. To say that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. under those circumstances should not be put on a parity with every other transaction of this kind in condemnation proceedings is an anomalous proposition. I have no license to present the case of the Baltimore & Ohio, but what I am interested in here and why I am pointing this out is this, that this is one proposition, it has one end in view, and that is the extension of the Capitol Grounds, and in order to do that you are compelled to have all of the property.

To take a part of it now and to wait in the future to take a part of it at some other time, or to provide for taking a part of it now and not to provide for taking the whole ultimately, it seems to me, would result in disaster in the future. In other words, it would leave a lot of isolated property on the hands of the Government that would be unprofitable to the Government. I say that we ought to make a plan here and we ought to provide, as was provided by the act of 1910, to acquire the whole of this property, and put everybody upon an equality. The condition of a lot of private owners down there is deplorable. I never thought until this was called to my attention that a great Government like the United States Government could conduct itself so as to absolutely confiscate some of this property. My attention was first called to this by a former constituent of mine, living in my own town, who owned property just this side of the new Post Office Building. He had there a prosperous mill, a prosperous business. Under the act of 1901, which provided for the obliteration of the grade crossings, they went around his property and filled up the streets as high as from 20 to 27 feet. They did it with railroad cars, filled it in, and actually crushed in his building and destroyed his business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] has stepped to his office, and the understanding was that he was to have 10 minutes when he came back. I desire to consume 10 minutes at this time. I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether or not he will have more than one speech?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There will be but one more speech on our side.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy 10 minutes. There are three principal differences between the report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and that of the gentleman from Kentucky. This matter was before our committee for quite a while. Eighteen months ago there was a condemnation and awards were made for land for the Capitol Plaza. Under the law under which the procedure was had the opinion of the Department of Justice was that the President had a veto power over the acceptance of the awards and payment and taking of the property, because after the provision of law for the adjudication of these questions there was a reservation that upon its approval—that is substantially it; I do not quote the exact language—by the President the property should become the property of the United States. The President disapproved the awards, as I understand, mainly because he believed that the award to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was excessive. The Attorney General was of the opinion that there should be no disapproval of one without the disapproval of all, and for that reason the President felt that he had no authority to settle with the small landowners and not settle with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

Now, in order to meet that situation the President and everybody who knew about the important condition of these people, some of whose property, as has been said by the gentleman from Ohio, having been virtually confiscated, have desired that some means might be reached by which they could be paid. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported a bill providing for a new commission to be composed of the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, the chairman of that committee of the House, and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] did not desire to act upon that commission, and that necessitated further action by our committee. The further action, Mr. Chairman, was that we recommended a new commission, composed of some one to be appointed by the Department of Justice, the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, and the other to be Mr. Harts, the officer in

charge of the Washington Monument, a public building in the District—I am not sure what his official designation is—and that that commission was to be given the power in the first place to settle and pay all those whose claims had been adjudicated who are willing to settle on the basis of the amount of the award, and in case any would not settle for that amount then the commission is authorized to have further condemnation proceedings in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Now, the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] leaves out entirely the question of condemnation, although we have further stated in our resolution that the President could not pay any more to any landholder than the amount of the award, but that the award itself, if a new condemnation were had, should not be in excess of the former award.

The gentleman in his resolution omits entirely the proposition of a new condemnation. He merely authorizes the President to go ahead with the purchase of the property or to appoint a commission to do so. Now, I think that that would not be a proper way, because we do not want a checkerboard system if we have any Plaza at all. And another reason, Mr. Chairman, the idea of the gentleman from Kentucky is a good one, no doubt—to a very great extent, at least—in that he has eliminated the probability of a new condemnation of the property of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. But suppose some well-to-do property holder who has property that was previously condemned and that condemnation set aside says, "Well, you have no right to take my property by condemnation, and therefore I will not accept the price that you offer." Now, his poorer neighbor across the street, in his strained circumstances, will have to accept the price, but the other gentleman can defy the Government and say, "I will not do it, because you will have to go into the courts and institute condemnation proceedings, and the Johnson resolution does not provide for any." Then, why not provide for a condemnation proceeding, and the commissioners can exercise it or not, at their discretion, and in that way compel settlements without condemnation. Again, Mr. Chairman, we guard it by saying there shall be no award and no purchase in excess of the price heretofore made by the former awards. Therefore I think that the gentleman from Kentucky is mistaken in the idea that he should limit it simply to the purchase, and I feel that at the next session of Congress, or very soon, when they see how it is working, we will have to pass another bill authorizing a condemnation. I see nothing wrong in providing for it in the first place. It is under the supervision of the President, and the President has the same veto power that he had before, and I do not see why gentlemen are so opposed to the personnel of this commission. Something was said in a previous argument in regard to opposition to Mr. Elliott Woods, the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Woods is dishonest and is a man who has been playing or is likely to play to the interest of the corporations and the great landholders of this city, as I understand it, he is under the Interior Department, and certainly a Democratic administration ought to remove an incompetent and dishonest official, if such a thing is true. Now, a jury is to be selected for the purpose of making the award under the Post resolution. The gentleman in his previous argument, as I recall it, has objected to that. Well, the court orders the jury and the marshal, a Democrat, will summon that jury, and certainly that Democratic marshal ought to find men enough in the District of Columbia to give a just award toward the Government and to the people. Mr. Chairman, I am willing for any kind of checks to be thrown around so that a great corporation can not take advantage of the Government in this manner, but I do not want others to seek to take advantage of the Government while these condemnation proceedings are going on. I would not want the well-to-do landholder to be in a position where he can say "I can hold you up"; but with the safeguards that are thrown around the resolution that will be offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post], it seems to me that it is very well guarded, and we can certainly trust the President, and can certainly trust the one appointed from the Attorney General's office, and certainly trust those other gentlemen designated, to do right in regard to this matter, and I believe that, with the possibility of condemnation proceedings hanging over them, that every single one of them, except the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, will be settled by purchase and by agreement between the Government officials and the landowners. And when we omit the condemnation, mark the prediction, you will find that the next session, or before a great while, at least, they will be coming to Congress and asking for the power of condemnation in order that they may get what they want—that is, the entire opening, as I understand, between the Capitol and the station. There may be some of those lands that belong to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad that ought not to

be taken. That can be determined by the commission. Full power and discretion to act in the premises is lodged with the commission and the President by the Post resolution.

If the commission and jury should go on and condemn lands beyond what they ought to, belonging to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad or anyone else, the President has the same right to reject it that he has always had. And the resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky says that no Member of Congress or ex-Member of Congress shall be a member of this commission. I care nothing for that. It is merely immaterial, Mr. Chairman, and does not strike me at all; but what I want is to get action, and action that will be perfect action and conclusive action, so that these people that have waited for 18 long months shall be paid what the Government justly owes them and to which they are entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there are two serious objections to the resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. One of those objections is the fact that it provides for a commission which is to be paid a salary. Those of us who have been here for any length of time know that whenever you establish one of these paid commissions their term never expires. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have in mind right now a commission which was created in 1908 to procure a map for the District of Columbia, and for which \$5,000 was appropriated. There were other appropriations following until finally it reached \$25,000, and that commission is just now about to conclude its arduous labors. So I am opposed to this resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky, because it provides for a commission to be appointed by the President and to be paid a salary in the discretion of the President, for they will never get through. And it simply means thousands of dollars out of the Public Treasury, and it further means that these poor people who own some of this property will have to wait for years to come before they can get their money from the Government. Another objection that I have to the gentleman's resolution is that I am satisfied it would not hold water in any court in the land. You can not prescribe one rule of action for determining the value of an individual's property and another rule of action for determining the value of a corporation's property. It is simply absurd, and no court in the land of any standing would tolerate such a law for a moment. The resolution to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] is just as well safeguarded as is the resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], and more so, and we get out of paying additional salaries, and we provide for a speedy determination of this matter upon a legal, equitable basis, and, if it is adopted, all these property rights will soon be determined.

But, Mr. Chairman, I rose for another purpose. The gentleman, my friend from Kentucky, made what I thought was rather a savage attack upon the gentleman who fills the office of Superintendent of Capitol Buildings and Grounds. I have a letter from Mr. Woods which I desire to read. It is addressed to me, and is as follows:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT,
UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1914.

Hon. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: In connection with the discussion of the so-called Plaza awards on the floor of the House, some remarks have been made more or less uncomplimentary to me. For instance, it has been stated that the original commission named by law to acquire the Plaza property, developed into a one-man commission. It has also been stated that the attorney representing the Government during the proceedings was "my" attorney or "his" attorney, leaving the inference that the attorney was representing me personally.

I have therefore thought it wise to formulate a memorandum which I attach hereto and which gives the facts, all of which will show: First, that, so far as our commission was concerned, no vital matter during the entire proceedings was carried out without the presence of all or at least the surviving members of the commission, and that the attorney in the matter was the attorney named by the Department of Justice to carry out the court proceedings.

I hope you will consider this memorandum carefully and use your own judgment in the use of it.

In conclusion, I will state that my presence on any commission named by Congress has never been sought by me. I have simply followed the dictates of the law in my best judgment, and always, so far as I could, act in the interests of the Government.

This is the first time in my 29 years' of public service that an implied reproach has been cast upon my conduct.

Respectfully,
Superintendent United States Capitol Building and Grounds.

The memorandum is as follows:

It is unnecessary to quote in full the original act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 738), or the subsequent act March 4, 1911 (36 Stats., p. 1414). These and the proceedings of the commission are given in a report to the House (Doc. 1392, 62d Cong., 3d sess.). The primal work of the commission appointed under the act was, and I quote from the report, as follows:

"* * * The commission organized June 28, 1910, and on July 8 advertised for sealed proposals for the sale to the Government of land

In the area to be acquired. In addition, copies of the advertisement were mailed to the owners of the property or their agents, so far as they could be ascertained. The proposals received were publicly opened August 10. It is estimated there are 462 parcels of land to be acquired, and proposals were received for 272 parcels, or about 59 per cent, representing 71 per cent of the entire area. After being scheduled and tabulated the proposals and accompanying papers were submitted to the Department of Justice for examination and report.

For what reason? Because not a member of that commission felt that correct information as to real estate or its proper value could be obtained except by means of expert examination from outside sources, expensive to the Government and beyond the power of the commission to pay for. Therefore the commission unanimously—all members present—decided to submit all bids received to the Attorney General. After submission of the entire matter to the Attorney General we received a letter from him dated October 14, 1910—from the Acting Attorney General—which, among other things, states as follows:

"I have carefully considered said schedules and bids and have been advised by competent persons skilled in real estate values within the 12 squares of ground covered by said act, and I reached the conclusion, and therefore recommend to your commission, that it would be to the interest of the Government and the property owners for the United States to acquire title through condemnation proceedings, by which method I think a fair and reasonable price for the land and improvements could be established."

Acting under and upon the advice of the Attorney General the commission, on May 9, 1911, determined to reject all proposals, and asked that he institute condemnation proceedings as to squares 634 and 685. This award was concluded April 22, 1912, and a report made by the Attorney General to the commission, which was approved; and an order was passed May 18, 1912—all commissioners present—as follows:

"Ordered, That the recommendation of the Attorney General be approved by the commission, and that the necessary steps be taken by him to make payment and obtain possession of the property referred to on behalf of the United States."

On August 23, 1912, the commission met—all members present—and "being convinced that the most economical method of acquiring the remaining portion of the land to be taken would be to secure an appraisal of the whole in one proceeding, to be paid for as appropriations are made by Congress in accordance with the act of June 25, 1910, and this course having the approval of the Attorney General the commission, on August 23, 1912, requested the Attorney General to institute condemnation proceedings against all the remaining squares except that part of square 633 west of Arthur Place."

In the interim Vice President Sherman died—October 30, 1912.

On January 29, 1913, the Attorney General reported to the commission that he had completed the condemnation proceedings as to squares 632, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 721, 722, 723, and that part of square 633 lying east of Arthur Place. In his report, and among other things, he says:

"I have given careful consideration to the awards made for each parcel of land, and believe that the same are reasonable, and have to recommend to your commission, if deemed advisable by you, that each and every award be accepted."

The commission accepted the recommendation of the Attorney General, and at a meeting of the commission February 6, 1913, Mr. Cannon and Mr. Woods—surviving members—present, the record shows:

"Acting upon your advice, the commission has to-day passed the following:

"Ordered, That the recommendation of the Attorney General be approved; at each and every award returned on January 29, 1913, in the proceedings for the condemnation of squares numbered 632, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 721, 722, 723, and that part of square numbered 633 lying east of Arthur Place, be accepted by the commission, and that the Attorney General be requested to take the necessary steps to secure the confirmation of said award by the court."

"It is respectfully requested that you proceed accordingly."

"Very truly, yours,

"J. G. CANNON,
"ELLIOTT WOODS,
"Commission for Enlarging the Capital Grounds."

Such are the main facts connected with the original proceedings. Is there any greater tribunal for such adjudication of values such as confronted the commission than the Department of Justice and the courts to which the commission applied for advice?

I think it will be seen that at no stage has that commission been "a one man commission." So far as I am concerned, I never have acted for the commission on any vital point except under the direction of the full commission as it existed prior to and after Mr. Sherman's death.

So far as I know, no representative of any corporation approached us on the subject, either before or after the enactment of the original law.

Some mention was made on the floor that the awards were confirmed four days before the expiration of time for filing exceptions. In this connection I quote from one of the memorandums furnished me by the former attorney of the Department of Justice, who during the time of proceedings was in charge of the case.

"When the awards or total sum became known it was too late to present the same to the Appropriations Committee of the House, so the same was presented to the committee in the Senate and placed in the sundry civil bill, and the award was confirmed four days before the time for filing exceptions by the defendants had expired. But it was necessary to do so in order to present the matter legally to the committee of the Senate."

"Having the award confirmed four days earlier than is the usual custom could do no harm to the United States, as the Government thereafter had the right to dismiss the proceedings at any period up to the actual payment of the awards. (District of Columbia v. Cemetery, 5 App. Cas. D. C., 497; Garrison v. City of New York, 21 Wall., 197; Schreiber et al. v. Chicago & E. R. Co., 115 Ill., 340; Norris et al. v. Mayor of Baltimore, 44 Md., 604; United States v. Dickson, 127 Fed. Rep., 774.)

"If they had a right to dismiss all, they had a right to dismiss as to a part, and the awards could have been severed from each other, as there was not one total award for all the squares, but an award for each parcel, each ownership, each owner being a separate and distinct defendant free from all others. If one owner accepted, no other owner had a right to complain, and if another owner was rejected the others could not protest. There is absolutely no reason why the private owner should not have been paid the sum awarded by the court commissioners and the matter left open to deal with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, if

that was thought to be necessary, and any statement to the contrary is an error."

I have no legal knowledge myself of such matters, but present these quotations for your information and consideration.

With reference to the statement that the railroad companies would settle their property for cost plus interest and taxes, my only knowledge on that subject is based on memory and one or two features of record in our proceedings. I remember that after the bids were submitted, on August 10, the commission endeavored to obtain by personal request some further information as to the bids submitted by the representatives of the railroad companies, deeming those bids too high. Replying to our representations, Mr. James McCrea, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and at the time acting as president of the Washington Terminal Co., stated in a letter on January 17, 1911, that the prices asked, so far as the Washington Terminal Co. was concerned, and which represented only squares 682, 684, and 721, were based on cost plus the interest at 4 per cent and taxes paid. The total price asked for these squares was \$496,234. The total award made on these same properties by the court proceedings was \$481,939, so that the award was \$14,295 below the asking price.

While I do not have the original bids at hand, I am informed that the awards made by the court for the railroad properties was approximately \$140,000 less than they asked in the first proposal.

I want to say, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Woods has never had anything to do with his name being proposed as a member of this commission, but it was a matter entirely with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and he was not even consulted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me for the discussion of this bill I believe I can commence in no better way than by saying that the resolution which I have offered could very well be entitled "A resolution to save to the Federal Government \$600,000." I believe that I can just as appropriately say that the resolution which will be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] as a substitute for my resolution might have for its title "A resolution to pay to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad \$600,000 more than it asks for its property."

We know that when the bill for the condemnation of this property passed the House on June 25, 1910, it passed by a majority of only 10 votes, and those of us who were here know reasonably well that that bill would not have passed at all except for the statements made by Mr. Tawney, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to the effect that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was willing to take original cost plus 6 per cent interest for its property. The original cost of that property has been accurately ascertained, and it has been set forth, lot by lot, in a speech heretofore made by me. When this 6 per cent interest has been added to that it is a mathematical certainty that it is now proposed to pay to the Baltimore & Ohio nearly \$600,000 more than they asked originally.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can not yield. The gentleman must remember that I did not interrupt a single speaker on the other side of this question.

Another thing to which I call the attention of this committee is that it has been sought through the press and otherwise to make this membership believe that property has been taken by the Federal Government, and that houses have been torn down, and that such property has not been paid for. No such condition exists. Every piece of property that has been touched in any way by the Federal Government has long ago been paid for.

Now, the question that arises is simply this: Are you willing for the individual property holders to sell their property to the Federal Government through a commission to be appointed by the President of the United States, at a figure not greater than the awards heretofore made, and then let the Baltimore & Ohio property come along later, just as was said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and acquired, if acquired at all, under another arrangement? The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is at this minute in court claiming that they have a valid award, and yet here comes another proposition that they be given another award, so that they may have two condemnation awards standing at one time. Then, which are they going to take? Of course they are going to accept the proposition which gives them the greatest amount of money. I say that they should not have that advantage.

Now, then, as to Mr. Woods. I have never intended to question and do not believe I have yet questioned his integrity, but I say that the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] fixes Mr. Elliott Woods upon that commission. Mr. Elliott Woods, should he become one of a new commission to acquire any of this property by purchase, is committed in advance to the former awards. He is on record as saying that they were just, equitable, and fair, including the awards made to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. He is so committed to that proposition that on the 24th day of February, 1913, he had Mr. Reese T. Strickland, the attorney representing

the commission, go into court and ask for the confirmation of those awards four days before exceptions could be filed. Contrary to all rules, no notice was given to anybody, but those awards were confirmed four days before 30 allotted days expired.

Elliott Woods stands committed in that way and in numerous other ways, too many to be mentioned by me in this short discussion, to the confirmation of the amount fixed upon the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad property, which is nearly \$600,000 more than they asked for it. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] says: "Are we to acquire this property in isolated lots?" Do not the gentleman from Alabama and everybody who was here when this bill passed and everybody who has read about it know that the plan was to acquire it to the extent of \$500,000 every year until the whole property was acquired? Yet when we come to carry out the provisions of that law we are criticized for it, and we are told that it should be acquired in one lump instead of in accordance with the act of June 25, 1910.

Now, I wish to emphasize the fact that no property has been touched by the Federal Government that has not been paid for, and that this commission which is to acquire this property by purchase, if it can, and by condemnation, if it must, should be a commission that has not already become committed to a certain price. One-third of this commission which is proposed by the substitute which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POST] will offer is committed by a formal motion made in court and by the recommendations that he has made to the Attorney General that that \$600,000 ought to be paid to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States shall appoint a commission of three men to complete the acquisition by the United States of so much of the real estate in squares 632, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 721, 722, 723, and also that part of square 633 lying east of Arthur Place, in the District of Columbia, as, in the opinion of the President, is desirable for the extension of the Capitol Grounds. The said commission shall have power to purchase any of said real estate at such a price as the said commission may deem to be the fair market value thereof, not exceeding, however, as to any lot or parcel, the amount of the award made therefor in the condemnation proceeding, district court action No. 1046, recently pending in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia: Provided, however, That the purchase price to be paid hereunder for any of said real estate which was owned by either the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. or the Real Estate & Improvement Co. of Baltimore City at the time when said action No. 1046 was instituted shall not exceed the bona fide, actual, original cost thereof to either of said companies, plus 6 per cent interest thereon from the date of purchase by either of said companies until the date upon which the court confirmed the awards made in the aforesaid district court action No. 1046.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. There is but one section to the resolution, the first paragraph of which has been read. Will it be read for amendment by paragraphs, or will amendments be in order only at the end of the reading?

The CHAIRMAN. There is only one section in the resolution, and in cases of that kind the practice is to read it by paragraphs. However, the Chair presumes it is immaterial.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] want to talk on this resolution?

Mr. RAINEY. I only want to ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution be treated as one paragraph for purposes of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as one paragraph for purposes of amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No purchase herein provided for by said commission shall be deemed to be complete until such purchase shall have been approved by the President of the United States. When the President has so approved, and the Attorney General of the United States has certified that all necessary deeds conveying to the United States the unencumbered, fee, simple title to the real estate so purchased have been delivered, the President shall cause payment of the agreed purchase price to be made to the person or persons entitled thereto. All such payments shall be made out of the appropriations heretofore made for the acquisition of said real estate.

Each of the purchases made in pursuance of the provisions of this resolution shall be deemed to be a separate transaction from any other purchase made hereunder.

No person who has, within the last five years, served on any commission or on any jury in any proceeding to condemn real estate in the District of Columbia shall be eligible to be a member of the commission herein provided for; neither shall any ex-Member of Congress or any Member of Congress be a member of said commission.

Each of the commissioners herein provided for shall, before entering upon the duties of the position, state under oath (or affirmation) that neither he nor any member of his family owns or has a lien upon any real estate, or has any financial interest whatever in any real estate within the zone herein set out; and, further, that neither he nor any member of his family has, since the institution of the court proceedings hereinbefore referred to, owned any stock in or bond of any corporation which owns land in said zone; and, further, that neither he nor any member of his family is the creditor of anyone who owns land in said zone; and, further, that neither he nor any member of his family is an officer of or has any stock in or bond of any bank, trust company, or other corporation which is the creditor of any person who owns real estate within said zone; and, further, that he is not financially indebted to any person, firm, or corporation which owns real estate in said zone; or who has any loan to any person who owns real estate in said zone; and, further, that he is not indebted to or employed by any person, firm, or corporation which owns or has a lien on real estate in said zone; and, further, that neither he nor any member of his family has, since the institution of the court proceeding hereinbefore referred to, accepted or used any pass or other form of free transportation upon any railroad or subsidiary thereof which owns, directly or indirectly, any real estate within said zone.

The members of said commission shall be paid, out of said appropriations and upon requisition of the President, a reasonable compensation for their services, which shall be determined by agreement between the President and the members of said commission before they enter upon the discharge of their duties.

The said commission may employ a clerk and a stenographer to assist in performing the work herein provided, if they deem such assistance necessary; but the compensation of neither the clerk nor the stenographer shall exceed \$5 a day while actually engaged in said work.

The improvement and upkeep of the land which may be acquired in the zone herein described and set out shall be paid, one half by the United States and the other half shall be paid out of revenues of the District of Columbia derived from taxation.

All laws to the extent they are in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 5, strike out all of lines 12 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAINEY. I make that motion for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the address made by the President of the United States this morning at the annual convention of the American Bar Association in this city.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech of the President of the United States, delivered at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in this city this morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will ask to have coupled with that a request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Illinois couples with that a request that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING. I object, Mr. Chairman. There is no connection between the two subjects.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] objects.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks as indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech of the President of the United States delivered at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in this city this morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we permitted on several occasions the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] to extend his remarks in the RECORD, a privilege which he has enjoyed. I think if one gentleman is permitted to extend his remarks another gentleman ought to be; and I therefore object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects.

Mr. RAINEY. I submit to my colleague that there is quite a difference between printing in the RECORD an address delivered by the President of the United States and a speech prepared by a Member.

Mr. MANN. I think a Member of the House is much better entitled to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting a speech of his own than for the purpose of inserting a speech made by somebody else, although I would not object except for the circumstances. I have no doubt it will eventually be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. POST rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to speak on the amendment?

Mr. POST. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I offer House joint resolution 352 as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 352, offered by Mr. Post as a substitute:

"Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) providing for a commission to complete the acquisition of lands for the extension of the Capitol Grounds, and providing for the payment thereof.

"Whereas proceedings have been had in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for the condemnation of certain real estate desired by the Government for the extension of the Capitol Grounds, which said land is fully described in said proceedings; and

"Whereas report was duly made by the jury selected under said proceedings as to the value of the several tracts or parcels of land embraced in the said proceedings and the amount that the several and respective owners thereof were entitled to have and receive for the same; and

"Whereas the acts of Congress authorizing the acquirement of said tracts or parcels of land provided that the approval of the President of the United States should first be had before any of the said land should be acquired by the Government and payment made therefor; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has reported to Congress his disapproval of the said report of the jury as to some of the awards made by it; and

"Whereas by reason of the President's disapproval of the said report in parts none of the awards could be paid; and

"Whereas there has been appropriated the sum of \$2,823,972.35 for the payment of said awards, the said appropriation having been made in the act making appropriation for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved June 23, 1913; and

"Whereas there are other moneys remaining of the appropriations made for such purpose in the sundry civil act of June 25, 1910, and the sundry civil act of March 4, 1911, and the sundry civil act of August 4, 1912; and

"Whereas it is deemed advisable that acquirement should be had of the said tracts or parcels of land and payment made to the owners thereof on an equitable and fair basis as soon as possible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, etc., That an Assistant Attorney General, to be designated by the Attorney General of the United States, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia and the Washington Monument, and the Superintendent of the Capitol Grounds be, and they are hereby, appointed a commission to complete the acquisition of the said tracts and parcels of land the subject of said proceedings, by either purchase or condemnation, making payment or settlement therefor out of the appropriations heretofore made and herein referred to, and in the acquirement of the said tracts or parcels of land the said commission to have power and authority as follows:

"(a) To acquire by purchase the said tracts or parcels of land at such price or sum as to the commission may seem just and reasonable: Provided, That the price agreed upon shall not exceed the amount of the award made for the same by the jury in the proceedings heretofore referred to, and to make payment therefor out of the appropriation heretofore referred to as having been made for the acquirement of the land in question, upon the owner or owners thereof making deed to the United States conveying to it a good and marketable title clear of all encumbrances: And provided further, That no such purchase shall be made unless the price to be paid has been approved by the President of the United States.

"(b) The said commission shall have the power and authority to proceed to acquire by condemnation proceedings such tracts or parcels of land as it has been unable to purchase.

"(c) That if condemnation proceedings become necessary the commission is hereby authorized to institute in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, sitting as a district court, by petition in the name of the United States, a proceeding in rem for the condemnation of such tracts or parcels of land; that such a petition shall contain a particular description of the land to be condemned, and the name or names of the owners of the said land and their rights therein, as the same may be ascertained, together with the plan of the lots or parcels of land to be taken; that the said court shall cause public notice of not less than 20 days to be given of the institution of such proceedings by advertisement in three daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, which notice shall warn and require all persons having any interest in the proceeding to appear in court at a day to be named in said notice and continue in attendance until the court shall have made its final order, and in addition to such public notice said court shall cause a copy of said notice to be served by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia, or his deputy, upon such owners of land to be condemned as can be found by such marshal or his deputy within the District of Columbia and upon the tenants and occupants of the same. The said court shall appoint a guardian ad litem for any person interested in such proceeding who may be under disability.

"(d) That after the return of the marshal and the filing of the proof of notice provided for herein the court shall cause a jury of six experienced, judicious, disinterested men, who shall be residents of and freeholders within the District of Columbia, not related to any person or the officer, agent, servant, stockholder, or bondholder of any corporation interested in the proceedings and not in the service or employment of the District of Columbia or of the United States or otherwise interested in such proceedings, to be summoned by said marshal, to which jury the court shall administer an oath or affirmation that they are not interested in any manner in the lands or lots to be condemned and are not related to any of the parties interested, and that they will, without favor or partiality, and to the best of their judgments, ascertain the damages to which each owner of land to be taken is entitled at its true market value.

"(e) That the court, before accepting the jury, shall hear any objections that may be made to any member thereof, and shall have full power and authority to pass upon any such objections and to excuse any juror or cause any vacancy in the jury when impeached to be filled; and after the jury shall have been organized and shall have

viewed the land and premises affected by such proceedings they shall proceed, in the presence and under the direction of the court, to hear and receive such evidence as may be offered or submitted on behalf of the United States or by any person or persons having any interest in the proceedings.

"(f) That when the hearing is concluded, the jury, or a majority of them, shall return to the court in writing their verdict, setting forth the amount found to be due and award to each owner of the lands or lots to be condemned. The said court shall hear and determine any objection or exceptions that may be filed to a verdict of the jury, and shall have power to vacate and set aside any verdict, in whole or in part, when satisfied that it is unjust or unreasonable, in which event the court shall cause a new jury of six experienced, judicious, disinterested men, who shall be residents of and freeholders in the District of Columbia or of the United States, to be summoned, who shall proceed to ascertain the damages due the owner of any lot or parcel of land sought to be taken, as in the case of the first jury; that objections and exceptions to the verdict shall be filed within 20 days after the return of the verdict to the court. But no award shall be conclusive unless the same has been approved by the President of the United States, who is hereby authorized to disapprove of any award made by the said jury, but his disapproval of particular awards shall not affect more than the award specifically disapproved, and all other awards shall be and remain fixed and conclusive. But such disapproval must be in writing filed in the proceeding within 60 days after the confirmation of the said report, and in the event of no such disapproval the said report as confirmed shall be fixed and conclusive.

"(g) That after 60 days from the confirmation of the award of the jury the commission shall cause the amount of such award, for any parcel or lot taken, plus the costs and expenses of the proceeding entered in the condemnation of such parcel or lot of land, to be paid out of the appropriation hereinbefore or hereinafter made for such purpose, unless the President has disapproved as aforesaid.

"(h) That the said court shall have full power and authority at any time to allow amendments in form and substance in any petition, process, verdict, record, or other proceeding, or in the description of property proposed to be condemned, whenever such amendment will not interfere with the substantial rights of the parties interested. Each juror shall receive as compensation for his services the sum of \$5 per day for every day necessarily employed in the duties herein prescribed. In case any of the owners of land taken as herein provided are under disability, or can not be found, or neglect or refuse to receive the money awarded to them, or in case the record is imperfect, or the title to the property is in dispute or uncertain, the amount of the award for the land taken shall be held in trust by the United States for such owners, and the title to any such land or lots shall become vested in the United States.

"(i) That to enable the commission to procure said parcels of land and lots it is hereby authorized to use the sum of \$15,000, or such sum as may be necessary, out of any money appropriated for the acquisition of said land."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post].

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I will state briefly the differences between this substitute and the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky. This substitute provides the complete machinery for the ultimate acquirement of all of this property. It provides who the commission shall be for the acquisition of the property. It provides that the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds shall be a member, that the overseer of the Washington Monument and the public grounds in the District of Columbia shall be a member, and then it provides that the Attorney General of the United States shall designate some Assistant Attorney General as the third member of this commission. All of the three are already United States officials and under pay. The resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky provides that the President shall appoint three persons. Who they will be I do not know. I think that a resolution appointing public officials already under pay is much better than what the gentleman provides for.

There are more than 350 of these pieces of property. The title to every piece must be looked into, and therefore it has been thought wise that the Attorney General should designate some assistant in his office as a member of this commission, competent to look after that branch of the work of acquiring the property.

The resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has what is to my mind a very peculiar clause with reference to the pay of the commission which he proposes the President shall appoint. That is found on page 5 of his resolution. It is provided there that the compensation shall be agreed upon before they enter upon their duties, and, as I conceive it, before they know what their duties will be. No one can determine in advance the amount of work involved in seeing all of these property owners, determining the value of their property and the title to it. It seems to me to be a very absurd proposition.

As was said by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has anything against Mr. Elliott Woods, he owes it to this Congress to make it known, and he should make it known. The gentleman from Kentucky has attempted to get converts to his resolution upon the bare statement that he is proposing to save to the Government of the United States \$600,000. Now, I want to call attention to some pertinent facts. The resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky provides that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. shall be paid the original cost of their property, with 6 per cent interest up to January 27, 1913. The Baltimore & Ohio

Railroad Co., under an act of Congress permitting it to do business in the District of Columbia, bought, in 1833, almost a century ago, its first piece of property in this city, and the property upon which the old Baltimore & Ohio depot stood upon until the building of the new station. It acquired another block northeast of that block in 1876, and that was all the property that it owned in this District until the act of 1901, the object of which was to compel the railroad company to obliterate their grade crossings and move their station. Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] says he is going to save the Government of the United States \$600,000; but I have taken occasion to investigate the value of this property, and if you take the original cost of all the property owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., or the Realty Co., which is a holding company of the Baltimore & Ohio, and compute 6 per cent interest on it, the value of its property will amount to \$1,638,961.88. The amount of the award is \$1,731,927, which is only \$92,965.12 in excess of the original cost and 6 per cent.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POST. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will make it brief, because I have not much time.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman include interest for all this time, nearly 100 years?

Mr. POST. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. While the railroad company owned and occupied and used the property?

Mr. POST. That is true; and you must allow something for the increment, the increase in value.

Mr. SIMS. I did not so understand it. I understood that it only allowed interest from the time when they ceased to use the property.

Mr. POST. Oh, no; this resolution is to allow them 6 per cent interest on the original cost.

In the debate of July 13, 1914, on Senate joint resolution 129 it was argued that the properties of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. included in said condemnation proceedings were acquired and held for speculative purposes.

This argument may be refuted by the acts and records of Congress itself. The squares and parts of squares owned by the said railroad company in said area of condemnation are 632, 681, 680, 682, 683, 684, and 721.

Square 632 was acquired under authority of the act of Congress of 1833, authorizing the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, under its Maryland charter, to extend its lines within the District of Columbia, and this square, with the approval of Congress and of the District government, was occupied by said company as a passenger station, and continued to be so occupied until compelled by Congress to abandon the station and to go into a union station, as provided under the act of Congress of February 28, 1903.

Square 681 was also acquired under congressional warrant in 1870 for a freight station, and was used as a freight station and yards until Congress by said act of February 28, 1903, compelled its abandonment in the latter part of 1907.

The remaining squares included in said condemnation, to wit, squares 680, 682, 683, 684, and 721, were acquired in anticipation and under the provisions of the act of February 12, 1901, which was enacted by Congress for the primary purpose of eliminating grade crossings in the District of Columbia and to provide more comfortable and attractive station facilities. This act required the Baltimore & Ohio to construct new terminals along lines stated and defined in said act and located south of the present Union Station, and included the very lands concerned in this condemnation proceeding.

The abolition of grade crossings, which had been considered in both Houses of Congress for many years prior to 1901, culminated in the act referred to, and when the location, even prior to the passage of the act, became fixed, the company begun in 1898 to purchase the property which it would be compelled under said act to acquire.

Almost immediately after the property required for location under the act of 1901 had been acquired, the movement to bring the railway companies entering Washington into a Union Station and terminals was inaugurated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia and others, and this movement resulted in the passage of the act of February 28, 1903, locating the present Union Station and terminals within the area specified in said act, and this rendered inapplicable for railroad purposes squares 632—which was the site of the old Baltimore & Ohio depot—681—which was occupied by its freight facilities—and all of the property acquired under the act of 1901 in 680, 682, 683, 684, and 721.

A small segment of the property involved and contained in one of the squares enumerated, being 721, was acquired under the Union Station act of February 28, 1903.

So that there is not a foot of Baltimore & Ohio property involved in these condemnation proceedings that was purchased speculatively or that was purchased without the warrant of Congress, and most of it was purchased under compulsory legislation by Congress.

But it is argued that this property, being purchased from 1898 to 1903, has been held, although not needed for the requirements of the Union Station act, until now for speculative purposes. This argument is as unfounded and as unjustifiable as the statement of a purchase for speculative purposes.

When the Union Station act of 1903 was passed, and until 1908, when the Union Station and terminals and approaches had been completed, all of the property, not only that included in the Union Station area but adjoining it, and particularly the property now in question, was in such condition as to make any sale or disposition thereof impossible. A new grade had to be established; large fills had to be made; new streets had to be laid out approaching the Plaza; the Plaza itself had to be completed, and, as stated, such conditions existed as to render any sale or thought of sale impracticable.

By reference to the records of Congress it will be shown that in 1909 and 1910 the purpose to acquire this property began to be agitated, and this agitation resulted in the declaration by Congress, in the act of June 26, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 738), to ultimately acquire all of the certain squares therein enumerated, including the squares covered by the condemnation proceedings now under consideration, for the enlargement of the Capitol grounds, and so forth.

When this act was passed it was impossible for anyone to make a sale of that property, shadowed by the declared purpose of Congress, as stated in the act referred to.

A part of this property was acquired under the authority of the act of 1833, and used, so long as Congress permitted its use, by the company for its old station and freight facilities. The rest of the property was acquired for the location under the act of Congress of 1901, and its use for railroad purposes prevented by the passage of the act of Congress of 1903. The building of the Union Station and terminal, ordained by Congress, prevented a sale until by the declared purpose of Congress to acquire this property a sale was made impossible.

It was claimed also in argument that the awards made for the railroad property were excessive. These awards were fixed by a commission authorized by Congress and appointed by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and composed of men of recognized fairness, integrity, and ability, and a comparison will show that the awards made to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for its property are no greater, but in many instances less, than the awards made to the owners of private property in the same area.

It was argued, again, that the Baltimore & Ohio at one time agreed to accept a lesser price for this property, and a statement made by Representative Tawney in a debate, when the act of June 26, 1910, was being considered, that the Baltimore & Ohio people agreed to take the original cost plus 6 per cent.

In further proof of an agreement to take a lesser sum for this property, a letter of George E. Hamilton, addressed to Maj. John Biddle on April 10, 1902, is referred to. This letter was written prior to the passage of the Union Station bill of February 28, 1903, and when the District Commissioners—the plan and purpose of said bill of 1903 being under discussion in the Senate committee—desired to furnish approximately the cost to the District of the Plaza and approaches to the Plaza, provided in said bill to be acquired and made at the cost of the District. The company furnished the commissioners with the cost price of those squares in which some property would be needed for the Plaza and street approaches.

There had been a tacit understanding between Mr. Lorea, then president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and the District Commissioners, that the company would convey to the District of Columbia such of its property as was required for the Plaza and street approaches under the bill at about its cost to the company.

The letter of Mr. Hamilton, written in 1902, did not place a price on all the holdings of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. within the area now being considered and condemned, but simply stated the price to be charged for the small portions of this large area desired by the District, and these portions to be used for Plaza and street approaches to the Union Station, both uses increasing the value of the remaining holdings of the company, and even if it could be tortured into an offer for the entire holdings of the company, the offer was not accepted, and the Government instituted its condemnation proceedings many years later.

To show that even the District did not construe this as a continuing offer, in its further dealings and ultimate purchase

from the railroad company for Plaza and street approaches to the Union Station, cost, interest, and taxes paid were the three elements considered and combined in final valuations.

Since 1902 the railroad company has paid to the District large sums of money as the annual taxes on these squares and lots. The taxes for the year ending June 30, 1914, on the railroad holdings within the condemnation area amounted to \$18,000.

The next communication made by Col. Biddle on this subject was of date February 17, 1904, and his letter is as follows:

There will soon be available an appropriation which will allow the immediate purchase or condemnation of land for the Plaza and intersecting streets near the new Union Station. It is understood by this office that a large percentage of the land needed is owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Washington Terminal Co., and the Real Estate & Improvement Co. Will you kindly advise this office what steps will be necessary on its part to acquire this land? Will you make offers for all or parts of the following lots, viz: In square 680, lots 11 to 17; in square 681, lots 3 to 14; and in square 682, lots A, B, C, H, 6 to 9, and 11? Although other property will be needed east of First Street, it is not understood that your company owns any lots in this territory needed by the District.

Very respectfully,

JOHN BIDDLE,

Major, Corps of Engineer, United States Army,
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Mr. GEORGE E. HAMILTON,

Attorney, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
Washington, D. C.

The subject matter of this letter was considered, and on April 21, 1904, answered, as follows:

APRIL 21, 1904.

Maj. JOHN BIDDLE,
Engineer Commissioner.

DEAR SIR: In your letter of the 17th of February, 1904, referring to the readiness of the District of Columbia to acquire by purchase or condemnation the land for Plaza and intersecting streets near the Union Station, you request to be advised what steps will be necessary on the part of the District to acquire land so needed and now owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and further, that the company, if it desires to sell, will name the price of lots 11 to 17, in square 680, hereafter referred to for convenience as parcel No. 1; lots from 3 to 14, in square 681, hereafter referred to as parcel No. 2; and lots A, B, C, 6 to 9, and 11, in square 682, hereafter referred to as parcel No. 3.

Parcel No. 1 was purchased by the company on December 8, 1898, for the sum of \$100,000, and is unimproved property. The company will sell the property included in this parcel to the District for the sum of \$100,000, with interest at 6 per cent, from December 8, 1898, to the date of conveyance to the District, and with taxes paid by the company during the same period. This will make the total purchase price of this property about \$135,000.

Parcel No. 2 was purchased by the company as far back as 1870 at the average cost of 80 cents per foot, and some of this property was unused until recent years. The company thinks that it would be only reasonable to hold this property at \$1.50 per foot, which would be very little more than the average paid by the company for property similarly located in that neighborhood and purchased in 1898-99, with some allowance for carrying charges.

Early in 1902 we suggested that this property might be sold at \$1.40, but because of the two years that have passed we think that \$1.50 should now be paid. The aggregate footage of lots in this parcel, referred to in your letter of the 17th of February, is 120,431, which at \$1.50 would make \$180,646.50.

In parcel 3, lots A, B, and C are unimproved, and were purchased October 23, 1899, at \$4,796.50. These lots are now offered for the purchase price, with interest at 6 per cent from April 23, 1899, and taxes for the same period, which would amount to about \$6,350.

Of the same parcel lots H, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 were purchased at various periods from 1898 to 1902, at the aggregate cost of \$20,950; and as these properties are supposed to have been rented, we omit taxes and interest, thus making the consideration for all lots in this parcel described by the District about \$26,400.

In regard to the foregoing, the figures named are approximate only, as it is impossible to calculate the interest until the negotiation is completed.

The Union Depot act, in section 5, authorizes the District Commissioners to sell or equitably exchange any portion of existing public space abandoned by reason of the adjustment of streets as an approach to the plaza or circle at Massachusetts Avenue, and the company would be willing to exchange, foot for foot, property owned by it for the portions of existing streets when such abandoned parts adjoin the property of the company not needed by the District.

If it should happen that only a part of any of the lots included in the foregoing parcels should be needed by the District, the company is willing to sell such parts, provided the remaining parts are not rendered unavailable.

Yours, very truly,

GEORGE E. HAMILTON.

On July 26, 1904, the following communication from the commissioners, signed by William Tindall, secretary, was made:

JULY 26, 1904.

Mr. GEORGE E. HAMILTON,

Attorney at Law, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 19th instant, I am directed by the commissioners to submit the following proposition in regard to the purchase and transfer of land within the proposed lines of the Plaza and streets leading to the new Union Railroad Station.

Two blue prints are inclosed showing, in red, property that it is now desired to purchase under the following terms:

First. That the railroad company retain the parts of lots 15, 16, 17, in square 680, marked in black.

Second. That the parts of the streets E and F, marked in green, be exchanged for parts of lots 14, 15, 16, and 17, in square 680, the portion exchanged being equal in surface measurement.

Third. That the District pay for lots 11, 12, 13, and the small residue of lot 14, in square 680, the sum of \$52,652.70, or at the rate of \$2.70

per foot. This is based on the price quoted by you and 6 per cent interest to the present date, together with all taxes since December, 1899.

Fourth. That the lots (with improvements) H, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11, in square 682, be accepted at the prices paid by the railroad.

Fifth. That portions of lots 13 and 14, in square 681, be accepted at the price of \$1.50 per foot, as offered by you, and that lots A, B, C, and parts of 18 and 19, in square 682, marked in red, be accepted at the price paid by the Baltimore & Ohio, plus 6 per cent interest from date of purchase and plus the amount of taxes from date of purchase to the present date.

The above is submitted with the condition that any compensation shall be waived for damage arising from changes of grade in front or along any new frontages created by reason of this exchange or purchase, and that you file a written assent to that effect and also to the oral agreement already made by Mr. Loree waiving claims for damages to property belonging to the railroad by reason of changes of grade in connection with the terminal work.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM TINDALL, Secretary.

This letter was formally acknowledged on July 28, 1904, and on August 20, 1904, answered as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1904.

To the honorable COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

GENTLEMEN: In further reply to your letter of July 26, containing proposition for the exchange and purchase of properties within the Plaza area, I am directed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to say that the general lines of the proposition made by you are satisfactory.

The company wishes, however, to call your attention to the fact that in order to square out their holdings in the exchanges it is desirable for them to own the segments of lots 18, 19, and 20, in square 680, lying between the north line of E Street as it now exists and the south line of the new street which cuts through said square 680. These parts of the lots named are small, and I have no doubt that you will be willing to exchange the same, the company to give an equal number of feet in said square 680 for the parts of lots 18, 19, and 20, as above described.

Between the measurements of the District and the company with regard to the areas of properties exchanged there is some difference, but these differences can be adjusted by survey of the property, and the transaction will, of course, be governed by the exact measurements according to such survey.

With these suggestions assented to, the company will accept the proposition of the commissioners, provided that the remaining property owned by the company and desired by the District within said area will be purchased on like terms.

Referring to the question of damages, I am authorized by the company to state that any oral agreement or understanding made or entered into by and between the District Commissioners and Mr. Loree will be regarded by the company, and that at the time of the transfer of the properties herein referred to a waiver for damages for changes of grade in front or along any new frontages created by reason of this exchange or purchase will be filed with the commissioners.

The interest, taxes, etc., to be computed to the date of the transfer.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE E. HAMILTON,
Division Counsel.

On November 18, 1904, the following communication was made by Col. Biddle:

NOVEMBER 18, 1904.

Mr. GEORGE E. HAMILTON,

Division Counsel, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Century Building, City.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of November 17 regarding the memorandum of agreement sent you with my letter of November 14, in which you state that the agreement is satisfactory in substance except the last item as to lots 18 and 19, square 682, where the price is fixed at 90 cents, which price you think should be 92½ cents, which is the price you state was paid by you for the property, I would state that the price of 90 cents was obtained from a memorandum showing the acreage price of several lots including 18 and 19, and this office agrees with you that the price should be 92½ cents.

Very respectfully,

JOHN BIDDLE,
Major, Corps of Engineers, United States Army,
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

On June 14, 1905, the negotiations indicated in the foregoing letters culminated in the following order of the commissioners and acceptance by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.:

JUNE 14, 1905.

Ordered, That the order of December 20, 1904, relative to the exchange and purchase of properties with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. is hereby modified to read as follows:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereby agree to the following exchanges and purchase of properties with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., viz:

First. The District agrees to convey to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. a part of F Street within the following metes and bounds: * * * containing 5,703.76 square feet. Also a part of E Street within the following metes and bounds: * * * containing 17,300.4 square feet.

Second. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. agrees to deed to the District of Columbia all of lots 11, 12, 13, and 14 and parts of lots 15, 16, and 17, in square 680, in the city of Washington, D. C., as included within the following metes and bounds: * * * containing 42,575.37 square feet, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to be paid at the rate of \$2.70 per square foot for 19,571.21 square feet of the land described in the above metes and bounds, and the remainder of said area, 23,004.16 square feet, to be in exchange for the 23,004.16 square feet contained in that portion of E Street and F Street to be conveyed to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., as set forth in paragraph 1.

Third. That the District of Columbia pay to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. for all those parts of lots 13 and 14, in square 681, in the city of Washington, D. C., contained within the following metes and bounds, * * * containing 9,772 square feet, at the rate of \$1.50 per square foot.

Fourth. That the District of Columbia pay to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. for lots A, B, and C, in square 682, in the city of Washington, D. C., containing 3,332 square feet, the sum of \$4,796.50, with

Interest at 6 per cent from October 31, 1899, to date of transfer, together with taxes between said dates. Also parts of lots 18 and 19, in said square, included within the following metes and bounds: containing 1,711.89 square feet of ground, at the rate of 92½ cents per square foot, with interest at 6 per cent from November 23, 1898, to date of transfer, together with taxes between said dates.

It is understood in the above agreement that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. shall pay all taxes on squares 680 and 681 up to December 1, 1904, the taxes on all other lots affected by this agreement being paid as cited above.

The auditor of the District of Columbia is authorized and directed to cause papers of transfer in above cases to be prepared, it being understood that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. shall furnish good and sufficient title; and if it can not be done as to any particular lot, the agreement shall apply to such lots as a clear and sufficient title can be given.

HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
HENRY L. WEST,
CHESTER HARDING, Acting,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The above agreement is accepted on behalf of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

HUGH L. BOND, Jr.,
Second Vice President and General Attorney.

All of these are on record in the office of the District Commissioners and may be seen; and from this negotiation, of record as aforesaid, it appears that all of the property required by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for Plaza and approaches, was based upon the understanding between Mr. Loree and the District Commissioners that the company would sell for about what it stood the company in cost, carrying cost of taxes and interest, and where opportunity afforded the foot for foot exchange between the District and the company was made; and, further, that taxes and interest were not charged on property for which the company, from the time of purchase to the time of sale to the District, received in rents sufficient amount to cover taxes and interest thereon.

This agreement between Mr. Loree and the District government was made, no doubt, on the ground that the improvements to be made by the District would help the project of making the Union Station a monumental structure, and would also increase the value of the remaining property owned by the company and its availability for sale.

The conditions and reasons that entered into this negotiation with the District are not in any wise applicable to the present condemnation proceedings or the purpose of the Government to acquire this property. The District was taking only a small part of these squares, and by taking it would make what remained more valuable for sale.

It will thus be seen from the voluminous correspondence passing between the railroad company and the representatives of the District of Columbia that the offer on the part of the railroad company contemplated only ground now included in the Union Station Plaza, and in the streets and approaches to the same; that it could not in the very nature of things have included the blocks and squares now sought to be acquired. Upon this offer the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, bases his whole argument. If mistaken in this respect, then his argument fails. The old Roman maxim, "Falsus in Uno, falsus in Omnibus," is applicable to his situation.

He has sought to gain converts to his resolution upon the assertion that he is attempting to save the Government \$600,000 from the rapacious maws of a soulless corporation. Anyone giving the subject careful consideration will soon discover that he is just as much mistaken in this respect as he is in regard to the alleged offer on the part of the railroad company. I doubt seriously whether any of the property of the company was appraised far from its real value by the commissioners in the condemnation proceedings. In proof of this I herewith append a comparison of valuation for taxation of the company's property and the award made by the condemnation commission. The assessors' valuation in gross exceeds the awards by \$44,120.

Comparison of valuation for taxation and awards of condemnation commission, plaza proceedings.

	Assessors' valuation.	Award.
Square 632 (Baltimore & Ohio).....	\$380,969	\$294,820
Square 681 and connections (Baltimore & Ohio).....	765,513	725,932
Square 682 (Baltimore & Ohio).....	160,671	239,933
	1,285,153	1,260,685

In other words, the tax assessors valued the property in these three squares belonging to the Baltimore & Ohio \$24,468 more than the amount awarded by the commission.

Without desiring to cumber the Record, I have selected the first four parcels in each of the squares under consideration, ex-

cept squares 633 and 680, where the division and combination of parcels make comparison difficult, and find the following:

	Assessors' valuation.	Award.
(Parcel 1 belongs to United States Government.)		
Parcel 2.....	\$15,740	\$15,360
Parcels 3 and 4.....	45,975	48,500
Parcel 5.....	26,145	17,430
Parcel 6.....	30,645	20,940
Square 684:		
Parcel 1.....	45,675	34,400
Parcel 2.....	8,412	7,870
Parcel 4.....	8,412	7,008
Parcel 6.....	8,712	7,708
(Parcels 3 and 5 are small alley lots.)		
Square 721:		
Parcel 1.....	4,335	5,080
Parcels 2 to 12.....	25,987	33,284
Parcels 13 to 17.....	10,867	21,481
Parcels 43 et al.....	36,481	28,674
Square 722:		
Parcels 1, 2, 3.....	8,617	7,515
Parcels 5, 6, 8.....	4,811	6,151
Parcel 7.....	4,800	4,500
Parcel 9.....	4,705	4,474
(Parcel 4 belongs to District of Columbia.)		
Square 723:		
Parcel 1.....	5,226	6,560
Parcel 2.....	4,783	4,900
Parcel 3.....	5,077	4,925
Parcel 4.....	5,077	4,850
	311,482	291,830

Showing again that the assessors' valuation exceeds the awards in these cases to the tune of \$19,652.

Mr. JOHNSON, the gentleman from Kentucky, seems to be obsessed with the notion that everybody connected with the former condemnation proceedings were imbued with ulterior motives. In his speech upon this question delivered in the House on July 13 last he not only impugned the railroad officials, the condemnation commissioners, the commission appointed under the act of June 25, 1910, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, but took a rap at ex-President Taft and members of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House, as well as the gentleman from Ohio. In this position I do not concur. I believe in the honesty and integrity of humanity in general; that President Taft and all the officials who were connected with or had anything to do with not only the enactment of the law by Congress of June 25, 1910, in which the Congress declared its avowed purpose to ultimately acquire all of this property, but that the Government officials connected with its acquisition and the commission constituted by Congress for that purpose acted in the utmost good faith toward all concerned. In conclusion let me say, no matter which of the two resolutions under consideration may be ultimately approved, it is my hope and earnest wish that the unfortunate victims of this congressional action whose property has been rendered unproductive, and who have been subject to burdensome taxes and the payment of heavy interest for a period now of over four years, may speedily be relieved from the unfortunate circumstances in which we find them, a situation of our making without their consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the researches made into the value of this property by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] the plain, naked fact remains that with 6 per cent interest added to the prices which the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. paid for the land a net saving to the Federal Government of nearly \$600,000 may be made if the original resolution be adopted.

The passage of this substitute would permit the bringing about of the condition which existed when the President was compelled to reject this original proposition. If the substitute should be adopted, that condition can again be presented to the President, and he ought not again to be confronted with that situation and again be compelled to hold off the individual property owners, if he should think best to do so, while the value of the Baltimore & Ohio property was being ascertained.

You can say all you please about this proposition. All those who are seeking to get this \$600,000 for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad can scratch their nails off, but this is one transaction that can not be covered up, and in favor of fairness and equity to the United States, once in the history of this Congress, I hope that this substitute will be voted down.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I can not agree with the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] that there would be any two awards pending at all. The history of the legislation, so far

as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. is concerned, is that that railroad company appealed from the decision of the court sustaining the motion of the representative of the Government to dismiss the proceedings, and in the statement that the appeal is still pending the gentleman is correct. I think that a commission of officials holding office under this administration would certainly not proceed to a second condemnation of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. property while that case was pending in the courts. They do not have to proceed with the condemnation; they could do it or not. Then, Mr. Chairman, if that dismissal is sustained we will be in the attitude of having no condemnation and only the right to purchase, because another condemnation could not be had. I am not standing here as the champion of any railroad company or any other corporations, but I have not lost faith in officials in this country. I believe that the three men named as commissioners in the Post resolution could be trusted to do right between the Government and any individual or corporation. The commissioners do not even select the jury. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] goes into extended details in his resolution as to who shall be the jurors and who shall not. A jury that will be selected by the marshal must, under the Post resolution, be composed of disinterested people, just like the chairman's State requires the jury shall be that tries *ad quod damnum* proceedings, just as substantially every State requires; and to go on and signify that they shall be this or that, when the general term that they shall be disinterested and qualified persons is all that your legislature or mine has ever sought to demand, seems to me is simply a work of supererogation. It does not frighten me to say that there shall be two awards pending, because that thing will never happen. Those commissioners never will say that we are going to have another condemnation proceeding and another award when an award is already *pendente lite* in the courts of the country, and I think that is a scarecrow conjured up in the fertile imagination of the able and distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask for information only—I do not want to make a speech upon this subject—do both propositions require that we must take all this property or none?

Mr. BURNETT. It does not. That is the very purpose of both the propositions—to segregate them and allow settlement for one without settlement for the other.

Mr. SIMS. I understood the proposition advocated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], to be that we can take these individual pieces of property at a sum not exceeding the award, without passing on the other, letting the other alone. Now, at a time like this, when we are levying war taxes and when some portions of our country are almost ruined by a war for which they are in no way responsible, why is it necessary to appropriate millions of dollars to buy a railroad company's property at all, at any price? The property is going to stay there. We are taking it simply to further beautify the most beautiful city in the United States. Why not let it go and take our chances hereafter as to further enhancement of value and pay individual people for their property, because they will be hurt if it is not done. I do not understand why it is, when we have to levy war taxes in order that the Government may run at all, that we are under any obligations to buy the property of any railroad company to beautify this or any other city.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. POST. The gentleman has not given the resolution consideration.

Mr. SIMS. I am asking for information.

Mr. POST. It is not necessary to have a condemnation proceeding in order to get all of this isolated property.

Mr. SIMS. That which belongs to the individuals?

Mr. POST. This is not an original proposition at all.

Mr. SIMS. But as I understand the gentleman's proposition is that we will go ahead and acquire this railroad property.

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, no.

Mr. POST. It does not require them to do it.

Mr. SIMS. But it permits the commission to do it.

Mr. POST. The gentleman is a lawyer and he understands this, that while this resolution provides for condemnation proceedings, if Congress passes the resolution, nevertheless if this commission should undertake to condemn the property under this proceeding, it would be met with the proposition that the court already has jurisdiction over the matter at the present time, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. having a suit now pending.

Mr. SIMS. But it could dismiss the appeal and give the commission jurisdiction.

Mr. POST. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly it can. I do not think it is necessary in order to take care of these individuals who are hurt that we should also make it incumbent to undertake possibly the paying of the award of the court for this railroad property or purchasing it in any way. We can cease to further beautify for a few years at least until we cease to further tax the people, in order that the Government may run at all, in extraordinary amounts and at extraordinary rates, made necessary by the European war. Besides, the property may be worth less in the future than it is now. I do not understand why it should be incumbent upon this Congress to pay the original cost of property with 6 per cent interest which has been owned nearly a hundred years and occupied by the railroad company all of that time and used for its business.

Mr. POST. But that is the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SIMS. I understand that; but even after calculating the interest upon this property, giving them interest from the time they acquired it, nearly 100 years ago, it still makes the amount of the payment \$600,000 less than this jury has awarded them. The gentleman from Kentucky, I understand, accepts the proposition in lieu of the award as made, not because he advocates giving them interest for a hundred years, or nearly so, at 6 per cent, but because to do so is a great saving to the Government rather than to accept this award, which is \$600,000 more than the interest on the property that they have had the use of all of these many years, and the accretions in value of that property that have been brought about by the improvement and growth of the city, due to the millions of dollars of appropriations by Congress out of the people's pockets both in Nation and city.

Let us wash our hands of this whole railroad proposition and settle the other matter as to individual awards, and wait to beautify that ground until taxes can be collected under a normal rate and not at a time when we are having to increase them on account of a foreign war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POST].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas appeared to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. POST) there were—ayes 17, noes 30.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks for tellers. Those in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Six gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution as amended, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WINCO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 331 and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 5614) to provide for the appointment of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls be taken from the Speaker's table and passed. It passed the Senate unanimously, and a similar bill has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5614) for the improvement of the foreign service.

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all appointments of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls general and consuls shall be by commission to the offices of secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, or consul, and not by commission to any particular post, and that such officers shall be assigned to posts and transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require: *Provided*, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interest demand further service, when such assignment may

be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer: *Provided further*, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher class except upon the nomination of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 2. That secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and consuls general and consuls shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows, with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto.

SECRETARIES.

Secretary of class 1, \$3,000.
Secretary of class 2, \$2,625.
Secretary of class 3, \$2,000.
Secretary of class 4, \$1,500.
Secretary of class 5, \$1,200.

CONSULS GENERAL.

Consul general of class 1, \$12,000.
Consul general of class 2, \$8,000.
Consul general of class 3, \$6,000.
Consul general of class 4, \$5,500.
Consul general of class 5, \$4,500.

CONSULS.

Consul of class 1, \$8,000.
Consul of class 2, \$6,000.
Consul of class 3, \$5,000.
Consul of class 4, \$4,500.
Consul of class 5, \$4,000.
Consul of class 6, \$3,500.
Consul of class 7, \$3,000.
Consul of class 8, \$2,500.
Consul of class 9, \$2,000.

SEC. 3. That section 1685 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1685. That for such time as any secretary of embassy or legation shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his salary as secretary of embassy or legation, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the ambassador or minister at such post; and for such time as any vice consul shall be lawfully authorized to assume charge of a consulate general or consulate during the absence of the principal officer at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his regular salary or compensation as a subordinate consular officer or employee, compensation equal to the difference between such salary or compensation and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the principal consular officer at such post."

SEC. 4. That a secretary, consul general, or consul of whatever class detailed for special duty outside of the city of Washington shall be paid his actual and necessary expenses for subsistence during such special detail: *Provided*, That such special duty shall not continue for more than 60 days unless in the case of international gatherings, congresses, or conferences, when such subsistence expenses shall run only during the life of the international gathering, congress, or conference, as the case may be.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations for promotion or for transfer between the department and the foreign service, the names of those secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and the names of those consular officers or departmental officers or employees who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon examination to have fitness for appointment to the lower grades of the service.

SEC. 6. That section 1674 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1674. That the official designations employed throughout this title shall be deemed to have the following meanings, respectively:

"First. 'Consul general' and 'consul' shall be deemed to denote full, principal, and permanent consular officers as distinguished from subordinates and substitutes.

"Second. 'Consular agent' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising the powers vested in them and performing the duties prescribed for them by regulation of the President at posts or places different from those at which such principals are located, respectively.

"Third. 'Vice consuls' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising and performing the duties within the limits of their consulates at the same or at different points and places from those at which the principals are located, except that when vice consuls take charge of consulates general or consulates when the principal officers shall be temporarily absent or relieved from duty they shall be deemed to denote consular officers who shall be substituted, temporarily, to fill the places of said consuls general or consuls.

"Fourth. 'Consular officer' shall be deemed to include consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, interpreters in consular offices, student interpreters, and consular agents, and none others.

"Fifth. 'Diplomatic officers' shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, chargés d'affaires, agents, secretaries of embassy and legation, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, and none others."

The offices of vice consul general, deputy consul general, and deputy consul are abolished.

SEC. 7. That no ambassador, minister, minister resident, diplomatic agent, or secretary in the Diplomatic Service of any grade or class shall, while he holds his office, be interested in or transact any business as a merchant, factor, broker, or other trader, or as an agent for any such person to, from, or within the country or countries to which he or the chief of his mission, as the case may be, is accredited, either in his own name or in the name or through the agency of any other person, nor shall he, in such country or countries, practice as a lawyer for compensation or be interested in the fees or compensation of any lawyer so practicing.

SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect on the day of its approval by the President, when all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are repealed.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know just what this bill does.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides that the secretaries to embassies and legations and the ap-

pointment of consuls shall be appointment to classes and not to posts. That is the principal purpose of the bill, and it rearranges the secretaries and consuls into classes so that when an appointment is made it is to a class, and that appointment is confirmed by the Senate, and then, if the President desires to transfer a consul or a secretary of an embassy or legation from one post to another in the same class he can do so without having to send the nomination to the Senate for confirmation, and at this particular time the State Department is very anxious that this bill should become a law, because in some posts in Europe the secretaries are not very much overburdened with work, and at other posts the work is greater than the force authorized by law to be sent there now can do, and there are some other—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does this increase the cost of the Diplomatic and Consular Service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it will.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The estimate is it will increase the cost of the Consular Service about \$31,000 and the secretaries of the Diplomatic Service about \$19,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I heard some reference in the reading of the bill about detailing some of these secretaries to the State Department at Washington.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is a provision of that kind. The State Department frequently has one or two—sometimes more—secretaries in the State Department to give information to the department about a particular section of the world about which it is anxious to acquire information, and under the present system when those secretaries are brought from their posts to the State Department here they have to take the position of a clerk in the State Department and get only the salary of a clerk instead of the salary of a secretary, which is not fair, and there is a provision which permits the State Department to detail these secretaries to the State Department at the salary the secretary was getting as secretary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not it provide he may remain there about four years?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not exceeding three years.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And an additional year after that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Two years and an additional year after that, if it is thought absolutely necessary to keep him there. Then there is a further provision in reference to secretaries and consuls, that when they come to this country and it is desirable, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, to have them go about the country and interview boards of trade and confer with business men that their allowance and expenses can be paid. The Senate passed this bill unanimously, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported it unanimously, and the State Department, I will say, is exceedingly anxious that this bill pass now, so that the congested work at posts like Paris, London, and Berlin can be relieved by the transfer of secretaries from places where the work is not so great at this time.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman just stated that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported this bill unanimously. Of course the gentleman did not refer to this print of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I referred to a similar bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to House bill 18654. Is that the same?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know whether it is the same?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There will be a few little changes in it.

Mr. MANN. I want to know what they are. We have no print of this bill. As far as I know, it has never been printed.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is practically the same. There is a difference of the date when the bill will take effect, and one of the classes of consuls is put at \$4,500 in the Senate bill, whereas the House bill had it \$5,000, and it ought to be \$5,000; and there are one or two amendments which I will offer.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman will remember that I spoke to him at one time in reference to what effect this would have on the appropriations we have already made. We make appropriation for certain posts at certain salaries now. That is carried in the Diplomatic appropriation act. Now, what effect will the passage of this bill have in connection with the appropriations already made? There are no appropriations made for these places?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. After I had the conversation with the gentleman from Illinois I conferred with one of the Assistant Secretaries of State, and we agreed upon an amendment that

would leave available all the appropriations that have been made up to this time for the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. MANN. Is that amendment incorporated in the Senate bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; I was going to offer it. I have it here in my hand.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] had expected to offer an amendment or so to this bill, as I understand from him, probably along the same lines as certain sections of the bill formerly introduced by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that those are what are known as the civil-service provisions of the bill as I originally introduced it, and we found that the bill could not become law with those provisions in it. And while the Committee on Foreign Affairs has a number of gentlemen on it who were strongly in favor of the civil-service principle, among them Mr. LINTHICUM, of Maryland, and Mr. COOPER, of Wisconsin, and others, they found that the bill would not become a law in any shape if it were insisted that those provisions be kept in it, and so I introduced another bill leaving those provisions out in order that the State Department might get the benefit of being able to transfer these secretaries and consuls at this time, when they are particularly needed. And I hope for that reason, in the interest of the public service and the foreign service, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] will not offer his amendments at this time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, can I get the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] into this? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Union Calendar bill. If consent is given, it may require the House to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider it. I do not know how long it would take, or whether any agreement can be made. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas expects to bring in a rule immediately?

Mr. HENRY. I am waiting now. I understood this would take only a few moments.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I would like to have unanimous consent to this, that as soon as the gentleman from Texas gets through with the matters provided for in the rule this bill be in order and we take it up by unanimous consent then.

Mr. HENRY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. POUL. Reserving the right to object, there is one other rule to follow the rule the gentleman from Texas has.

Mr. MANN. Supposing the gentleman, then, asks unanimous consent that this bill be treated as a privileged bill, with the right to take it up—

Mr. HENRY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that the gentleman make that request later. In the meantime we will have an opportunity to examine it. I would like to see the amendments that are to be proposed.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I can show the gentleman the amendments in two minutes. They are simply to provide that the appropriation that has been made for the Diplomatic and Consular Service shall be still available. That is one amendment. The other amendment is simply to change the date at which this bill shall go into effect. Another amendment is to change \$4,500 to \$5,000. The Senate made a mistake as to a class of consuls and put them in a \$4,500 class when they belong in the \$5,000 class. It is a bill that the State Department has been urging for weeks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that I shall object, but I hope the gentleman will make his request after the disposition of the rule.

Mr. MOORE. I hope the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] will not press his unanimous-consent request now. There are some questions about this bill that some of us will want to look into.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. All right, Mr. Speaker; I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Texas how many rules he has?

Mr. HENRY. Only one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

COTTON AND TOBACCO.

Mr. HENRY. There is another rule to follow, but the gentleman from North Carolina will present that, and I now present the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 656 (H. Rept. 1199).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider S. 6398 and S. 6505 in the order

enumerated; that said bill shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and shall be the continuing order of the House until disposed of; that there shall be not exceeding one hour's general debate on each bill and not exceeding 30 minutes on each bill for amendment under the five-minute rule, to be equally divided between those supporting and those opposing the bills. At the conclusion of the debate on all said bills each bill, with amendments thereto, shall be voted upon separately, and the previous question shall be considered as separately ordered on each bill with amendments to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit on each of said bills: *Provided*, That it shall be in order for the House to consider the following amendment to S. 6398, which said amendment shall not be subject to any point of order under the general rules of the House, to wit:

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in national banking associations and in State banks situated in States producing cotton or tobacco, or both, the sum of \$250,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The said Secretary shall make such deposits under the terms of this act and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by him to carry out this act. The deposits herein directed to be made shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the number of bales of cotton or pounds of tobacco produced therein during the year 1913, as ascertained by the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of the Treasury, in lieu of the securities he is now authorized or required by law to exact of the banks in which the funds of the United States are deposited, is authorized and hereby directed to accept as security for the deposits directed to be made in this act cotton warehouse and tobacco warehouse receipts, where the cotton or tobacco thereby represented has been fully insured, at a valuation that represents the fair market value of the cotton or tobacco covered by such receipts. The deposits herein directed to be made shall be made only on the condition that the banks accepting such deposits will loan the same, under reasonable terms and conditions, at a rate of interest not to exceed 4 per cent per annum, to the producers of cotton or tobacco, or the owners of lands upon which same was produced during the year 1914, and the said Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations concerning the terms and conditions under which these deposits shall be loaned by the banks that accept the same.

"Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in his discretion, either immediately cause to be prepared United States notes to the extent of \$250,000,000 to be used for the purpose of making the deposits in compliance with this act, which said notes shall have all the legal qualities of the United States notes now outstanding, and shall be of such denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, and said notes shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum from the date of their issuance and shall be payable in gold coin of the United States or its equivalent on January 1, 1916; or he may sell not exceeding \$240,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds, heretofore authorized by law, at a rate of interest not exceeding 4 per cent per annum, and the act or acts heretofore passed authorizing the disposition of said bonds are hereby amended so as fully to authorize the disposition and use of such bonds as herein prescribed; or, in his discretion, the Secretary of the Treasury may use both the proceeds of the bonds and the notes in order to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed in the aggregate \$250,000,000.

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not require the repayment of any deposit made under the provisions of this act prior to December 31, 1915.

"Sec. 6. That when the deposits herein authorized are called in by the Secretary of the Treasury the same shall be and become a part of a special fund, to be kept and held separate and apart from the general funds of the Government, for the redemption and retirement at maturity of the Panama Canal bonds in such cases and to such extent as the proceeds of such bonds have been used to make the deposits herein provided."

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, inasmuch as I see no member of the Committee on Rules on his side at present, how much time he would like to have for the discussion of the special rule?

Mr. MANN. Say half an hour on a side.

Mr. HENRY. That will be entirely satisfactory to me. So, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 30 minutes of my time. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas yields 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HENRY. And I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered in order at the end of the hour.

Mr. MANN. I would not do that. Somebody might want to offer an amendment to it. I do not think I will do so.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move the previous question at the end of the hour.

Mr. HOWARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. Does that preclude offering amendments to this bill?

Mr. HENRY. Oh, no.

Mr. HOWARD. You mean on the rule?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia did not ask the Speaker, so the Speaker will not give him an answer.

Mr. HENRY. I did not ask the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] a question.

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Did he answer it satisfactorily?

Mr. HOWARD. I asked the gentleman from Texas the question, and he said, "Oh, no." I presume he was answering it understandingly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for an hour, and announces that he will move the previous question when he gets ready.

Mr. MANN. That is, in an hour?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair knows; and he proposes to yield 30 minutes of it to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman from Georgia asked me if the bill will be open to amendment after the adoption of the rule, as I understood, and I said it would be open to amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. After the expiration of one hour?

Mr. HENRY. Yes. Does the gentleman want to amend the bill or the rule?

Mr. HOWARD. The bill.

Mr. HENRY. It will be open for amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. That is all I wanted to know, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for one hour, one-half of which he announces he will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. DONOVAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. I want to ask some one in authority, either the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] or the Speaker, a question. This is an important matter here, and the question I want to ask is, Does the gentleman from Texas intend to proceed on that matter with the small number present?

Mr. HENRY. I intend to proceed for awhile.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is a great stickler for a quorum generally, and—

Mr. HENRY. I think I can see a quorum here to-day.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is inconsistent. He has held it up to us that a quorum is necessary for us to do business. Now I appeal to the gentleman: Has he fallen from grace? [Laughter.] Does he intend to go forward with this business without a quorum? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. I will say to the gentleman that I am trying to hasten the adjournment of this Congress.

Mr. DONOVAN. In an unparliamentary and illegal way, I will say, because under the rules we are not allowed to do business without a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut is out of order. If he wants to ask a question of anybody, that is all right.

Mr. DONOVAN. I have not got an answer yet, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. I think I see a quorum here.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman intend to proceed without a quorum?

Mr. HENRY. I think we have a quorum here.

Mr. DONOVAN. I insist upon an answer.

Mr. HENRY. I intend to proceed.

Mr. DONOVAN. Without a quorum? [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Yes; without a quorum.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall insist upon a quorum being present. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that it is not necessary to separate the sheep from the goats, so we will let it run along as before.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] moves a call of the House. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Britten	Carr	Decker
Alney	Brodbeck	Cary	Deltrick
Allen	Brown, N. Y.	Casey	Dies
Anderson	Browne, Wis.	Chandler, N. Y.	Donohoe
Ansberry	Browning	Church	Dooling
Anthony	Bryan	Clancy	Doolittle
Austin	Buchanan, Ill.	Connelly, Kans.	Doughton
Avis	Burke, Pa.	Connelly, Iowa	Driscoll
Baker	Burke, S. Dak.	Conry	Drukker
Baltz	Burke, Wis.	Copley	Dunn
Barchfeld	Calder	Cramton	Elder
Bartholdt	Callaway	Crosser	Estopinal
Beall, Tex.	Campbell	Dale	Faison
Bell, Cal.	Cantor	Danforth	Farr
Bowdle	Carew	Davenport	Ferris

Fess
Fields
FitzHenry
Fordney
Fowler
Francis
Frear
French
Gallagher
Gallivan
Gard
Garner
Gerry
Gillett
Glittins
Good
Gordon
Gorman
Graham, Ill.
Graham, Pa.
Green, Iowa
Greene, Mass.
Gregg
Griest
Griffin
Gudger
Guernsey
Hamill
Hamilton, Mich.
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hammond
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Hayes
Helgesen
Hill
Hinebaugh
Hobson

Howell
Hoxworth
Hughes, W. Va.
Hullings
Igoe
Johnson, Wash.
Jones
Kahn
Kelster
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kennedy, R. I.
Kent
Kettner
Kless, Pa.
Knowland, J. R.
Konop
Lafferty
Langley
Lee, Pa.
L'Engle
Lenroot
Levy
Lewis, Md.
Lewis, Pa.
Lindbergh
Lindquist
Linthicum
Loft
Logue
Lonergan
McAndrews
McClellan
McGuire, Okla.
McKenzie
McLaughlin
MacDonald
Madden
Maher

Manahan
Martin
Merritt
Mitchell
Mondell
Morin
Moss, Ind.
Moss, W. Va.
Mott
Mulkey
Murdock
Neeley, Kans.
Neely, W. Va.
Nolan, J. I.
Norton
O'Brien
Oglesby
O'Hair
O'Shaunessy
Palge, Mass.
Palmer
Parker
Peters
Peterson
Phelan
Platt
Plumley
Porter
Powers
Reed
Relly, Wis.
Roberts, Mass.
Roberts, Nev.
Rogers
Russell
Sabath
Scully
Seldomridge
Sells

Shackleford
Shreve
Slomp
Sloan
Smith, Md.
Smith, J. M. C.
Smith, Minn.
Smith, N. Y.
Stephens, Cal.
Stephens, Nebr.
Stevens, Minn.
Stevens, N. H.
Stringer
Summers
Sutherland
Switzer
Taggart
Talcott, N. Y.
Taylor, N. Y.
Temple
Ten Eyck
Thacher
Thomas
Towner
Treadway
Volmer
Volstead
Wallin
Walsh
Walters
Watkins
Weaver
Williams
Willis
Wilson, N. Y.
Winslow
Woodruff

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifteen Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. KORBLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KORBLY) there were—ayes 8, noes 67.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the rule is plain. I do not see how we could add any language to it that would make it any clearer.

It provides that immediately upon its adoption the House shall proceed to consider two Senate bills—one S. 6398 and the other S. 6505. These bills have passed the Senate. They have come to the House and have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that committee has reported them to the House and they are now on the calendar. The resolution further provides that there shall be 1 hour's general debate on each bill and 30 minutes' debate under the 5-minute rule on each one of the bills. It furthermore provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment that is added, notwithstanding any point of order that may be made against it under the general rules of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman state how much time is given under the rule for the discussion of this most important amendment that the gentleman has referred to?

Mr. HENRY. I have just stated that there will be on the bill and all amendments that are offered one hour and a half of general debate and debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule does not so provide.

Mr. HENRY. Oh, yes; it provides that there shall be that much discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HENRY. Just for this one question, because I do not want to detain the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not possible under the rule to withhold the offering of that amendment in which your side is most interested until the close of the 30 minutes for debate under the 5-minute rule, and thereby cut off any debate on it whatever?

Mr. HENRY. The rule speaks for itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule does not say anything on that.

Mr. HENRY. There is no difficulty about offering amendments and having 30 minutes' discussion.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the exact bill that I had hoped would come before the House, in the form in which it should have been worded. But the principle is in exact accord with all the bills

I have introduced on this subject. We have been undertaking to shape legislation on this question for two long months. Day and night, in season and out of season, individually I have been endeavoring to meet with my colleagues on both sides and see if we could not get on common ground in order to meet the great emergency that has arisen in the South.

The bill is the best proposition that the Committee on Rules could bring before you gentlemen for consideration. It does bring that important question before the membership of this House in order that it may be discussed and considered. We say to you and to our people that it is right that we should debate it and vote upon it, and we want to say to you on that side of the House that we are now confronted with the greatest problem that has come before our people since the close of the Civil War. Many of our people—farmers, bankers, merchants, and our railroads as well, besides other interests—are facing bankruptcy, and we think it is necessary for this great Government to come to the rescue of the South and aid us in this crisis. When you do it you preserve the business interests not only of the Southern States but of every State in this Union and contribute to the welfare of all of our people. I hope this special rule will be adopted. I trust that these matters can be debated thoroughly in this House, and that we can record our votes. We have been ready to aid the people in the other parts of this country when they were in distress and needed the assistance of the Federal Government. When a great fire swept from the face of the earth the town of Salem, Mass., those of us from the South stood ready to respond and go to the aid of those people. When San Francisco was stricken with the great earthquake and fire, all of the Representatives from the Southern States were ready to vote to send aid and succor to those distressed people. When the great flood swept along the Ohio Valley and brought ruin and destruction to the people there, our fellow citizens of the United States, we of the South were ready to go to the aid of those people. Aye, more than 10 years ago, when the far West was asking that the credit of this Government be extended to them in order that they might make their arid lands irrigable and establish homes for the people in all those great Western States, we went to their rescue and extended the credit of this great Government to the amount of more than \$82,000,000, in order that they might have homes and firesides for their families. And to-day with this great crisis upon us, brought about by reason of the terrible struggle going on across the Atlantic Ocean, we must have aid, and must have it speedily, or ruin is facing the southern people.

I do not doubt the patriotism of any man on the floor of this House, whether he be Democrat or Republican. We are all Americans, and love that flag over the Speaker's head and will pay it the homage to which it is entitled from all American citizens. Gentlemen, this is not a partisan or political question. It is nonpartisan, and if there ever has been an occasion since the bloody conflict that occurred between our brothers of the North and the South when we should lay aside partisan and sectional feeling it is now, and I believe when you gentlemen understand this question as our southern people understand it you will come to our rescue as promptly and speedily as we have gone to others and as we will go to you in the years that are to come. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is prospect of distress among the southern people on account of the cotton crop and the partial failure of the market. I realize that there is distress in other parts of the country because of the failure of people to realize the hopes that they may have had when they reaped the harvest, when they built their mills, when they planted their trees—failure, sometimes because their market is cut off in Europe, but more often because the market is cut off or partially destroyed in this country. If the Treasury of the United States is to be called upon to meet disaster to business, to meet the ruined hopes and the failure of men without work to get their daily bread, and all parts of this country are to be helped by the Treasury of the United States, no \$250,000,000 in currency will meet the call. In other parts of the country they are going forward as fast as they can, and we hope that some time in the future their markets may be restored and that shops may be opened and that people may get work—yes, and that even perishable crops may find a market before they have perished and lost their value. But it would have to be a graver situation throughout the whole country than any that faces it now to have me cast my vote in favor of the proposition that is brought before Congress to-day.

The people of the North are not now insensible to what is going on in the South. A proposition has been made upon the

part of the banks to raise a fund of \$150,000,000 to be loaned out to the cotton planters of the South on crop security, and even wicked Wall Street comes forward with a proposition to contribute \$50,000,000 toward this fund, to be expended and loaned for this purpose, and, as I understand it, \$50,000,000 more are in sight from northern cities other than the city of New York; and the southern banks are willing and trying and expecting to raise \$50,000,000 more. That is a transaction between people who are loaning their own money, a business transaction, far different than calling upon the bounty of the Government; far different our undertaking, being merely the trustees of the people's money, to take the money of the people and loan it to private individuals. No threatened disaster would induce me to vote for the proposition contained in this amendment—\$250,000,000 of United States notes to be issued upon security—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Two hundred and fifty million dollars of United States notes to be issued, without additional security, upon a security already standing for notes amounting to \$346,000,000 which have been standing for years, and these notes to bear interest. I can not vote for a proposition to increase these notes, to inflate the currency of the United States; we are getting far toward the limit of inflation of the currency of the banks. We are going too fast. Some day there must be a reckoning, and that reckoning will be far worse than if the people of the whole country to-day, having courage for the future, should gird up their loins and fight for the credit of the country and for the aid of private business or to help out their neighbors anywhere they may be. I am not going to say anything about the appeal which will meet me at home, or suggest even the appeals I have had to come out and help my own people if this is to be granted and this bounty is to go out to the people of any section. Mr. Speaker, I can not support any proposition of this kind. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the form of the rule, and yet I understand the situation, in what we hope to be the closing days of the session, when it may be necessary in the adoption of a rule to be a little more drastic than would ordinarily be the case. No one doubts that a great emergency does exist in the country; that men are suffering in many cases, either on account of economic legislation or the war. I shall not stop to discuss to which, in my opinion, the difficulties are attributable. A situation does exist in the cotton-raising States which I should think was unique in history. I do not recall in all my reading of history—and I have read a good deal—any case in all time which is like the present situation as to cotton, an article which can not be used at home, but which must be produced for the convenience of mankind. Without wool and cotton life would certainly be very different from what it is now, and the world is dependent on the production of this article for its comfort; and here comes a situation where, by reason of facts which are well known to us all, there is no price for cotton. The producer practically is without a market, and it is not possible, as I view it, for the world to consume the present cotton in existence without some aid being given to carry it over to future years. [Applause.] I do not like the rule, which I shall swallow, but because of the exigency of the case, the emergency which exists, I hope that this side of the House will vote for the rule and give us an opportunity to express ourselves upon at least one proposition. [Applause.] I will say frankly I can not vote for the amendment which will be offered. I am not willing to authorize the issuance of \$250,000,000 of legal-tender currency and enter upon a program which in the end must inevitably mean such an inflation of legal-tender notes as will make them valueless. We have a gold reserve of \$150,000,000 to protect three hundred and forty-odd million dollars of legal-tender notes which are issued by law, and every Congress has refused, during heated times as well as in cool blood, to increase the quantity of legal-tender notes. I hope that it never will be done. But whether the amendment shall be agreed to or not, whether this proposition now offered shall meet the situation or not, in the opinion of the majority, I think that certainly the human mind—and we pride ourselves upon living in the age when human thought is at its best—certainly the human mind ought to be able to search out and find a remedy for an acknowledged danger, to protect not only the South but the country from the inevitable result of great bankruptcies. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], or I will yield him five if he desires it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I think three minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I am for the rule which is before us for several reasons. In the first place, its adoption will permit the enactment into law of two bills which have been passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House—two bills whose enactment immediately is made necessary by the present financial condition of the country. I am for the rule, Mr. Speaker, also and especially because I believe the present acute situation throughout one-third of the United States needs and should receive governmental aid. [Applause.] In my student days, I recall, I learned one fundamental principle of economics. It was that any enterprise too large and too great for private control and one in which a large part of a people are interested can properly be entrusted to the Government as a legitimate object of governmental attention. The situation in the cotton-growing district of our country more than meets these requirements. The area primarily affected is very large, embracing one-third of our land. But this unprecedented situation affects not only the region where cotton is actually grown, but in a larger sense it affects our entire Nation. Directly, the cotton growers of the South are affected; indirectly, the cotton wearers and all inhabitants of the land are affected. Our country is one of diversified industries, and yet there is an essential reciprocal relation existing between the industries and between the several localities. Whatever affects one more or less affects all the others. But regardless of that, Mr. Speaker, this is one country, and whatever affects any part of it is the concern of all of us. While the people I represent are in the northernmost part of the Union and are not as immediately concerned as many of the people of the far South, nevertheless they are interested, and I know I voice their sentiments when I say something should be done by the Government for the relief of the distress in the South. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAINEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that while we are at peace with the world, as we are, that nevertheless the cotton situation in the United States is precisely the same as if we were at war and our ports were blockaded. We have the product, a wonderful supply, but our market abroad has been curtailed as though by a blockade, the great crop is about har-vested, but it can not be sold. It is here on our hands. The men who have raised it are not able to sell it. They must meet the expenses of production, with no chance to realize on their product. The world needs, we need, this industry to continue to be prosperous. Every person in our land would suffer if the South should cease the production of cotton. The South's interest is a nation's interest. It is our duty, as a legislative body for all the people, to respond justly and generously to the distressed cry from the great South. There is no patriotism in sectionalism. He who does not respond whenever need exists anywhere within the United States does not correctly reflect the spirit of our country. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is the province of the Government, through this Congress, to take some action, and take it now, in order to relieve the situation and save a great and important industry in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this rule that is presented by the Rules Committee is as drastic a rule as was ever presented in the palmiest days of former Speaker Cannon. The Democratic Party is about to reverse itself in its position in criticism of the Republican Party for occasionally, on emergencies and exigencies such as this, bringing in a rule to meet the conditions. I recall two or three occasions when drastic rules were presented, one for the consideration of the famous Aldrich-Vreeland currency bill, which every Democrat on that side voted against, not only the rule but the bill itself, and subsequently reversed itself in this Congress by voting to continue the bill in force; next the postal savings-bank bill, which gave no latitude for amendment, and now here we have a rule under the guise of offering amendments, but which, in fact, does not permit amendment to the main proposition in controversy. The rule provides that there shall be but 30 minutes for amendments under the five-minute rule, and during that time an amendment may be presented to consider the Henry cotton-loan proposition. He may offer it at the very close of that half hour's discussion under the five-minute rule. That would not give any opportunity for amendment, but I recognize, as I recognized in Republican days, the need of passing such rules as this for the

consideration of this proposition, and it is up to you now to concede by your votes on this rule that the Republicans were justified in passing in exigencies such rules as I have referred to.

I recognize that there is need for the consideration of Senate bill 6398, which the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported. That bill is designedly for the relief of the Southern States in meeting the emergency there. Instead of limiting the national banks in the issuance of the Vreeland emergency circulation to 30 per cent of the 125 per cent of the capital and surplus of the banks backed by commercial paper on which emergency circulation may be issued, it is extended to 100 per cent that may be issued on commercial paper. What is the purpose of that?

It is that the southern farmer may go to his local bank with his warehouse certificate and obtain a loan based on that warehouse certificate. The southern bank in turn can have emergency note circulation to 100 per cent of its capital and surplus, based upon that commercial paper. That will amount, I might say offhand, to a quarter billion dollars additional circulation that will be available to the Southern States for the use of the southern banks in floating and tiding over the southern cotton situation.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman know that he is in error in that, because the Secretary of the Treasury classes the warehouse receipts as securities and not as commercial paper? The gentleman is evidently in error there.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not intend to go into the details of the mechanism by which it might be brought about. A cotton farmer gives his note, and that note will be commercial paper, backed by a warehouse receipt.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman evidently did not understand my question.

Mr. STAFFORD. That commercial paper will be the support for the issuing of emergency bank notes under this Senate bill.

Mr. WINGO. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Under the Aldrich-Vreeland Act, in the exercise of his authority given there, the Secretary of the Treasury has classified the paper as security, so that this act will not affect that class of paper at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I question whether I am in error. The very purpose of the Senate bill is to give relief to the South in the manner I have indicated. But the Henry amendment proposes for the National Government, through the banks, to buy cotton to the amount of \$250,000,000, for a loan to the producer at its fair value at 4 per cent is virtually its purchase.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] is recognized.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, this is not a political question. I would scorn to make a party question of it, even were it in my power to do so. The southern cotton planters are in a desperate situation. The cultivation of cotton is a most peculiar business. The South exhausts itself every year in making its cotton crop. Every man who is familiar with the raising of cotton knows this to be true. The poor man invests his all in the crop, and when he gets 6 cents a pound for it instead of 12 cents a pound it can readily be seen that it means ruin to him.

There is another peculiarity about the business of raising cotton. There is not a great deal of profit in it. I do not know in my entire knowledge of a single man who has made a fortune out of the business of raising cotton. I do not know of a single man who has made as much as \$100,000 out of the business of producing cotton. If he has made his fortune, it has been by the aid of some side line.

Now, when you are helping the South you are helping the whole country. As everybody knows, cotton brings in an enormous quantity of gold. The Committee on Rules, therefore, under these circumstances, felt justified in bringing in this somewhat unusual rule. We do not insist that the amendment we propose is perfect by any manner of means. We offer it as the best plan we could evolve for the time being to help our people in their distress, and if it does not do what we hope it will do we ask you not to criticize it; we ask you not to find fault with it, but we ask you to join with us and help us to frame some measure which will save that section of the country and the country at large from the ruinous loss which is bound to follow.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Certainly.

Mr. BULKLEY. How many amendments could be offered to the proposed Henry amendment?

Mr. POUL. The intention of the committee was to throw it open to amendment.

Mr. BULKLEY. Is it not a fact that if one amendment and an amendment to that and one substitute for that amendment were pending, that would satisfy all for the time being?

Mr. POUL. The purpose was to offer the amendment that was printed in the rule and to throw that measure open to amendments generally. That was the spirit in which it was brought out, and I think that is the proper construction to be put upon the rule.

Mr. BULKLEY. You think there could be no limit to the number of amendments that could be offered under the rule?

Mr. POUL. I am not sure about that. I can not say that; but our purpose was to throw it open.

Mr. HENRY. My purpose, I will say to the gentleman, was to throw it open to amendment; and if anyone asked unanimous consent to extend the discussion to two hours, so as to discuss it under the five-minute rule, I was in favor of doing that.

Mr. POUL. That was the purpose.

Mr. MANN. Under the rule 15 minutes are allowed in which amendments can be offered by those who favor the amendment and 15 minutes in which amendments can be offered by those who oppose the amendment; that is three on a side. That is quite a small limit, so far as the number is concerned, to the amendments that could possibly be offered.

Mr. HENRY. We thought that six amendments were all that could possibly be offered.

Mr. MANN. Those who are in favor of the amendment probably will not offer any amendment, and there can be only three gentlemen recognized who are opposed to it, who could offer any amendment.

Mr. POUL. The point I want to emphasize is this, and I say it in the utmost sincerity: I echo the sentiment of every man here and of my people and of the entire South when I say that we all feel there ought to be some way to meet this emergency. As has been said time and again here, it affects not only our people, but there is a whole pyramid of interests dependent upon the liquidation of this crop at a fair price, and whenever you knock out the bottom blocks of that pyramid the whole structure is bound to fall. There ought to be statesmanship enough in this House and in the other Chamber to do something in this hour of our people's desperate plight to relieve this situation, certainly to some extent, and it is in that spirit that we appeal to our Republican brethren and our Democratic brethren from every State in this Union.

If this bill will not prevent the dumping of this crop on the market at ruinous prices, then we ask you to help us write it so that it will accomplish that result. All our people ask is sufficient funds to enable them to take one-third of this crop off the market until normal conditions are restored. Now, Mr. Speaker, just one thing more. Let us hope that nobody is trying to gain any political advantage in this distressing situation. I would scorn to attempt such a thing. My people would look with scorn upon such attempt, for I tell you here and now that in my lifetime I have never seen my people in such a condition as they are to-day. They are a brave people. They have been to the brink of the river that is called ruin, and they have drunk to the very dregs of the cup of bitterness more than once, and they always come up smiling, and they will do it this time. But I tell you again no man has ever seen a parallel of the situation which confronts us to-day, for it has never existed. My people feel that they have a right to come to Congress and ask, not that you give them anything—they are not asking for a donation—but they do ask that the Government make a loan, every dollar of which will be returned, to enable them to tide over this temporary emergency. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the export statistics of cotton will afford some idea of the destruction of the foreign market.

In August, 1913, we exported 257,168 bales of cotton; in August, 1914, we exported 21,210; in September, 1913, we exported 930,312; in September, 1914, we exported 125,778.

It has been suggested that private capital will abundantly supply the needs of cotton producers. We have been told that certain gentlemen are at this time forming a pool to aid in liquidating the cotton crop. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that this statement is true, for I have a fear—a very great fear—that pools have already been formed, not to put up the price of cotton to a point near the cost of production, but rather for the purpose of keeping the price down.

On yesterday I was told by a well-informed gentleman, who had just returned from a trip through the eastern cotton mills, that spinners are not buying cotton now for 6½ cents because

they confidently expect, as they told this gentleman, to be able to buy all the cotton they will need at 5 cents or even less.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, this great Government only is great enough and strong enough and rich enough to save these people from ruin. There are plenty of precedents. In years past the Government has time and again deposited money at this point or that point, with a condition expressed or implied as to how such deposits shall be used.

God forbid that any southern man should turn his back upon our people in this hour of threatened disaster. God forbid that any patriotic man in this Chamber should turn his back upon this people in this hour of impending ruin. This is not a sectional question. It is a great, broad, national question, which affects every interest in every State of the Union. The sale of the cotton crop at any price means gold for the American people. The sale of the cotton crop at a higher price means more gold for the American people. The gold that this crop will bring back is the very basis of the Nation's credit.

We appeal to you all—Democrats, Republicans, Progressives—we appeal to your Americanism to help put through this measure. If you will help us, a great people will rise up as one man to call this Congress blessed. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state to the House that the rule, in the form in which it is presented, is not the rule that was asked for by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House; and while I am not authorized to speak specifically for the Banking and Currency Committee, I am quite sure that I am within the limitations of fact when I say that the Banking and Currency Committee would not have asked for the rule in the form in which it is presented to the House from the Committee on Rules.

I desire to say, furthermore, that there is no Member of this House who has greater anxiety for the situation in the South than have I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GLASS. May I have one minute more?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. GLASS. As I shall point out in general debate, it is my firm judgment that we already have upon the statute book laws which, together with the bills proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee, are sufficient to remedy the situation in the South. I believe as sincerely as I ever believed anything in my life that if this House will simply pass the two proposed amendments to the Federal reserve act favorably reported nearly three weeks ago by the Banking and Currency Committee, the Federal reserve banking system can fully and thoroughly take care of the situation in the South.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I have only a minute, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENRY. I will yield to the gentleman another minute. I want to say that the rule brings up those two bills for consideration and then makes it possible only to offer this other as an amendment; and if the amendment is defeated, your two bills will be considered, if the rule is adopted.

Mr. GLASS. I understand the gentleman from Texas yields me an additional minute.

Mr. HENRY. Yes; I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. GLASS. In that minute I desire to say that never, at any time, have I feared to go upon record upon this proposition, and never, at any moment, was I unwilling to take a vote upon this or any kindred proposition. I think, however, that the best way to settle the matter is to permit us to amend the rule, and present the question to the House as the Banking and Currency Committee formally requested it should be presented, and that is to vote down the previous question and amend this rule by voting down the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, advocated by the gentleman from Texas. That will put everybody upon record. That will speedily determine the question here and leave nobody any longer in doubt as to what the temper and mind of this House is upon these various problems. Therefore I shall vote "no" upon ordering the previous question upon this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, even though I desire that these two bills be enacted into law, I am unable, however, to bring myself to vote for the amendment proposed to be offered. I wish to make a suggestion to the gentlemen from the cotton States. I do not know that it will be of value to them, but it

may be of some assistance in this matter. Everyone would be glad to vote for some legislation that would relieve the situation in the South. It affects the material prosperity of the entire country. The only question is what particular remedy will accomplish the desired purpose. It was suggested a short time ago that certain banks form a pool and raise \$150,000,000 in gold, to be used in financing the situation relative to the cotton crop. Certain New York banks agreed to contribute \$50,000,000 to that fund, upon a single condition, that the Federal Reserve Board should have control of its administration. The press of the country, either to-day or yesterday, makes the statement that the Federal Reserve Board has not the authority to control the disposition of the fund. Why not prepare an amendment which would give, either for a temporary period or for such emergencies, the Federal Reserve Board the authority it would need to manage and control such a fund, and let it care for the situation in that way?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is the gentleman's information accurate in respect to the position of the New York banks?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is just a statement I saw in the press.

Mr. HARDWICK. I heard only this afternoon that one reason they would not subscribe to the pool was because they did not want to go in at 6 cents a pound.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know the reason other than as published; but if that statement be correct, it would be the part of wisdom, and I think everybody would be willing to unite in the adoption of such a provision that would extend such relief. A hundred and fifty million dollars in gold would be worth a great deal more than \$250,000,000 of paper money unsecured by anything for which there is a ready market.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, more than a month ago I stood on the floor of this House and pleaded with the Members of Congress to give relief to the South without delay. To-day the same bill I tried to get before the House is proposed by the Rules Committee with an amendment. The distress of the South has grown worse from day to day. Since the day I tried to get action on the cotton bill the southern Members have been striving to agree upon a bill acceptable. This amended bill has in part been approved by the cotton conference, composed of Members of the House. This is not a perfect bill and should be amended, but not by propositions that can not pass both Houses and become a law. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to Members to forget their selfish interest in their own bills and now present a solid front for a measure that can be passed. Do not load down this bill with amendments containing cotton-tax legislation and limit of production. This Congress is not ready to enter the field of limiting agricultural production by taxing the product. This session is about to come to a close; soon there will not be a quorum, and I appeal to the southern Members to get together on this bill with proper amendments, and I believe we can pass a bill before we adjourn. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this bill should provide that when banks receive emergency deposits, to be used in loans to farmers, and such banks fail to so loan the deposits, the amount should be returned to the Secretary of the Treasury within 15 days. This is a time when banks should not expect to make the usual interest on loans.

Mr. Speaker, as an humble Member of this House, making no pretense to leadership and desiring no personal glory by the enactment of cotton legislation, one who would serve his country well, one who loves all sections of the Union, and one who loves far better still the red old hills of Georgia, I plead with you to hear the Macedonian cry of my people and help us before we adjourn. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal in what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] has just said—that these bills are in danger of being loaded down—but the vital amendment is different. I question whether under the rule there can be any amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposing a \$250,000,000 loan. I question whether, even if we cared to go beyond cotton or tobacco, as proposed by him, we could introduce any other farm product seeking relief. There is distress in other sections of the country besides the South, for which relief might fairly be asked on similar terms,

but they could not be considered under this amendment. It is made special to the South, although I doubt very much whether it is altogether the southern spirit that comes into the House now to ask for Government aid in the manner in which it is asked for in this amendment. It is a question whether there is not too much pride on the part of the southern people to come to the Congress of the United States asking for financial aid in commercial transactions, when similar aid would not be accorded to other business in other sections.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference between a flood which devastates a city or a valley, as the result of which people ask for relief, and a commercial transaction involving profits and prices. The southern people went through one of the greatest periods of distress known to history during the Civil War. They suffered losses from which they have not yet fully recovered, but they never asked the Government for aid. The brave and heroic fight of the men and women who survived that great struggle put them again upon their feet.

In the present emergency, arising from a falling in the price of cotton, various remedies have been suggested. If the governors of the Southern States were to meet to-morrow and agree to call together in special session the various legislatures, it is possible they could come to an understanding that there should be no more than a certain limit of cotton planted or grown. That would be one way by which the price of cotton could be held to a rising scale. Nor do gentlemen who talk of the distress of the South seem to have given consideration to the possibilities of the South, with its magnificent soil and its splendid climate, in the raising of other commodities than cotton, which has been its great monopoly. In this respect the South is favored, but it has not availed itself of all its opportunities. It has relied exclusively upon cotton and the foreign market which brought back its foreign gold. That transaction, upon which the South had placed its dependence, was suddenly stopped by the European war.

The problem, therefore, is one of business and finance, such as affects other products that dare not come to Congress for relief. It is not a question of men applying for work or of the hungry appealing for bread; of houses washed away by flood or towns swept by fire; it is a question of financial distress, a question, in fact, whether cotton shall be held up to 12 cents or some other figure per pound. Just how we can vote for such a proposition I do not know. When some of us asked for protection to industries in this country against foreign competition there was a general outcry against it from the very Representatives who are now asking for direct appropriations for their special commodity. They denied protection by law to the very industries in this country that were extensive users of cotton. We were told, though we sought to buy more cotton and to use more cotton, that though our men needed work and our banks needed money our industries were "special interests" and should not be protected. Thus was disparaged one of the means by which such an emergency as has arisen in the South could have been obviated.

But now the opponents of the protective system are themselves asking protection, not for farm products generally, nor for industrial products which have suffered reductions in price and profits, but for cotton and tobacco only. The whole plan is a reversal of the Jeffersonian doctrine, so often repeated in Bryanistic utterance, of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." If we are to use the public funds to purchase cotton to keep up the price, what shall we say to the producers of other crops which are bitten by the frost or that otherwise contribute to the owner's losses? If the most fertile soil that God has given to this country has been used exclusively for the raising of cotton, which is now in trouble, may we not say to the southern planter, "If you will turn your attention to other crops?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a producer of cotton I sincerely hope that this rule will be adopted. Ninety days ago the South was happy and prosperous. To-day she is suffering. We do not ask you for a gift, but we ask you for a loan, with the very best security. We ask you to aid us to prevent bankruptcy and ruin over the Southland, and, Mr. Speaker, we ask you to help save this great Union nearly \$1,000,000,000. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I believe his statement is absolutely correct to the extent that the committee would not have asked for this relief for the people of our part of the country, for ever since I have been a member of that committee that committee has not shown a tendency to do anything for the benefit of the farmers of the country. The Democratic Party in its platform, in its pledges to the people, and in the pledges of the President promised the people of this country a rural credit system that, if it had been enacted, would to a large extent have relieved the situation in the way of the emergency that now confronts us. Now, Mr. Speaker, I never expected that relief would be given to our people. I do not expect it now. I do not expect it when gentlemen coming from the South, chairmen of great committees, use their influence to keep relief from the South that the people of the South will ever get relief. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that only one more speech will be made on this side.

Mr. MANN. As I have only just one minute remaining, I yield that to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the deplorable condition of the cotton States and, in hopes that something may be brought about that will bring relief, I shall vote for this rule. [Applause.] One objection I have to the proposed amendment is that it includes only cotton and tobacco. The conditions that have been described as existing in the cotton States are general throughout the country. Only this afternoon I talked with one of the most prominent Democrats from the Pacific coast, and he told me that never before were industries in such condition in that section as they are to-day. Many of them are upon the very verge of bankruptcy. The people do not see any relief. Why should not the Government help them? If the industries of the South are to receive the paternal care of the Government, why not all?

I hope that after we take care of cotton and tobacco something will be done for the other industries of the country.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is a fair rule. It simply provides for the consideration of two Senate bills proposing amendment to our currency laws that have been favorably considered and reported with amendments by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and that, in one of these bills, a certain amendment designed to relieve distressed conditions in one great part of our country, where 30,000,000 people reside, shall be considered. A fair and reasonable opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for amendment under the five-minute rule is allowed, when we consider the lateness of the session and the anxiety of the Members to return to their homes and to their districts.

Mr. BULKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BULKLEY. How many amendments is it possible to offer to the amendment which the committee proposes?

Mr. HARDWICK. Six; and there are not more than six different propositions to the amendment, if that many. There are six opportunities for amendment to this proposition, and that is fair and reasonable. There are not more than that number of propositions involved in it, if so many.

Now, if you will pardon me just a moment, I will say, first, to the gentleman that I am willing, if we can get unanimous consent, to throw it open further than that if it should be seriously thought that there is any necessity for further opportunity to amend.

Mr. BULKLEY. I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent now to amend the rule.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will if there is any disposition in the House to regard it as necessary or desirable.

Mr. HENRY. Let me ask the gentleman, how many amendments are to be offered?

Mr. BULKLEY. I do not know. I conceive that a great many more than six good amendments could be offered.

Mr. HENRY. In good faith, how many have you?

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to refer to several propositions that have been advanced to-day on this floor by gentlemen, some of whom favor and some of whom oppose this proposition. In the first place I deny, as emphatically as human language can be,

employed for that purpose, the proposition that there is any aim or charity or largess in this bill for the South or anybody in the South. We are simply proposing by this bill to do what we have done, both Republicans and Democrats, in many administrations through the Treasury policy. Not long ago we made a conditional deposit in the National Park Bank, of New York, of \$400,000, and a conditional contract during this very administration that a million dollars more should be left there, on condition that that bank handle the notes of the State of Tennessee. [Applause.] Not long ago, during a Republican administration, when Mr. Roosevelt was President of these United States, we sent \$150,000,000 to the banks of New York City on condition that those deposits should be employed in a certain way, to save threatened financial institutions in that great metropolis, as was disclosed in the Money Trust investigation. And I ask you, if we can send \$150,000,000 to save the financial institutions in New York through the use of the deposit system, why have we not the right to send relief to 30,000,000 of our people in the South in that same way? We are not applying in this bill, so far as this branch of the question is concerned, a single principle that is new or a single practice that is untried. What we want to do is simply to express the conditions on which these deposits are to be made in terms of the statute rather than in terms of the Treasury order or Treasury policy. I think it has come to a pretty pass if it can be said on this floor or elsewhere in this Republic that the Congress of the United States, elected by the people, has not as much right to say where and on what terms the deposits of public money shall be made as the Treasury Department has. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. May I interrupt my colleague?

Mr. HARDWICK. Just for a moment.

Mr. GLASS. It is as to a question of fact. I would like my colleague to specify when this Government, under Mr. Roosevelt or under any other President, ever permitted \$150,000,000 to be sent to New York in the manner in which he has stated.

Mr. HARDWICK. It was to relieve the panic of 1907. He sent this money—\$150,000,000 at one time—to the great banks in New York City, and, I am informed, without charging them any interest; and, more than that, on the 29th day of September, 1914, speaking in the city of Cincinnati, the present Comptroller of the Currency, of this administration, boasted that within 60 days of the time at which he was speaking the Secretary of the Treasury had shipped \$40,000,000 to be deposited in the Subtreasury in New York, there in turn to be put in the depositories of the Government in that city. Let me quote the exact words of Mr. Williams, in order that I may be accurate in this matter and that the House and country may understand exactly what happened according to Mr. Williams himself. Mr. Williams said:

Responding promptly to urgent appeals, the Secretary of the Treasury went over to New York Sunday afternoon, August 2, and held a conference that night with a score or more of the presidents of the leading banks and trust companies of the metropolis. He heard their statements, analyzed the situation quickly, saw what was necessary to enable the banks to meet the demands upon them and to restore confidence, which had been so rocked by the world-shaking events of the week.

Again, Mr. Williams said:

Anticipating the situation as it was laid before him at that conference, he (the Secretary) had that Sunday morning, before leaving Washington, directed the shipment by express to the Subtreasury at New York of \$40,000,000, and the Treasury forces and the express companies at that moment were taxing their resources in hurrying the execution of the order.

Since the amendment of August 4, vitalizing the Vreeland-Aldrich bill, had not then been adopted, and since the Secretary of the Treasury sent this money by express to the Subtreasury at New York, I think it fair to assume, as I believe the fact was, that the funds in question, the \$40,000,000 "expressed" in anticipation of the wants of the New York banks, was Government funds that were subsequently deposited in the New York banks that were Government depositories.

Now, I do not blame the Secretary of the Treasury for coming to the relief of these New York banks, whatever the method he employed of affording such relief; nor do I criticize him for "anticipating the situation" even in advance of that conference with the New York bankers. On the contrary, he is to be commended for the promptness and decision with which he met a situation and averted a calamity in one part of our great country at a most critical period—

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I think if my friend will examine the RECORD he will find—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield, and to whom?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not yield to anyone.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, gentlemen, all that we propose to do here is to say that in like manner the deposits of Government

money shall be made in certain other sections of our country which need relief as much as any city or any section of this country has ever needed relief since the Government began. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And surely we have the right to demand by statute for our own people when they are in distress, to demand for our own section when it faces bankruptcy and ruin, as much as we gave freely to other cities and other sections of the country without the formality of any statutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is one new proposition, I admit, in this bill, and that relates to the method we employ to raise this money. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KORBLY] seems to be amused at the question. Surely the situation is too serious to warrant levity. If we have not the money in the Treasury, how are we going to raise the money necessary to deposit in these banks?

Mr. KORBLY. Take it away from the taxpayers.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think we can do it without doing that. We can issue United States notes with all the legal qualities of the outstanding notes that we now have, \$346,000,000, and yet they will be notes that will not, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has suggested, be a menace to or a burden or a drain upon the gold reserve of this country. I can see difficulties in issuing any sort of notes that could be used immediately and presently to draw upon the gold reserve under existing conditions, and therefore this proposition is not framed that way.

The proposition here is to issue these notes, with these qualities, redeemable on the 1st of January, 1916, in United States coin or its equivalent. We will take them in the South—every one of them, and gladly. Everybody else in this country will take them. There will be no trouble about it. The credit of the Government has not sunk so low, has not fallen to a point where there is any trouble about that sort of a note, bearing 2 per cent interest, being readily acceptable anywhere in this country, for after 13 months they are redeemable in gold.

If the \$346,000,000 of greenbacks and all the forms of currency that we now have that are redeemable, under the Treasury policy, in gold are held up by our present gold reserve; if every dollar of those forms of money can be bolstered up by this reserve, relatively small in amount, surely it will not be damaged or impaired by these \$260,000,000 of notes, due in 13 months, and which can not become a charge on the gold reserve before January 1, 1916.

More than that, we have provided for the calling in before January 1, 1916, of every single deposit made under this bill, and the banks in which they are made will furnish the funds for the complete retirement of these notes by January 1, 1916. The depositories in the South will be liable to the Government just as banks in New York City were, just as those banks in the city of Dayton, Ohio, were liable. We do not ask you to send us money and not hold the Government depositories that receive it liable. We are not asking for a direct loan to our cotton planters. We simply ask you to deposit money which, if you do not want it yourselves, our people will take and be glad to get, in the depositories of the United States and require those depositories to pay it back before it can become a possible charge against the Treasury of the United States or the gold reserve. In other words, we ask you to lend to your own depositories, to the depositories of the United States, to the solvent banks of this great part of our country, your and our credit for 13 months, and during that period to deposit in our banks the public funds of the Government; and I say to you that a Government that has for years used its deposits of public money to move crops and to relieve distress and to avert panics in many other parts of our country under conditions that were not one-half so terrible and distressing as those now confronting the South, and would now hesitate for one moment to do so to save 30,000,000 people, would, in my humble judgment, fall far short of its duty and responsibility in the premises. [Prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves the previous question on the resolution. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GLASS. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 82, noes 39.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-one Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, automatically a roll call is ordered on the question.

The SPEAKER. That is true. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will vote "aye" and those opposed will vote "no."

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GLASS. I made a motion to adjourn. Was it not in order to make that motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. GLASS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. Had not the Clerk commenced the calling of the roll?

The SPEAKER. No; he had not commenced the calling of the roll. The Chair did not hear the gentleman from Virginia when he made the motion to adjourn. The question is, Shall the House adjourn?

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 76.

Mr. BORCHERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. That point has already been made. The motion to adjourn is lost. The Clerk will call the roll on the ordering of the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 101, noes 72, answered "present" 7, not voting 248, as follows:

YEAS—101.

Abercrombie	Evans	Johnson, S. C.	Rubey
Adamson	Falconer	Keating	Rucker
Aswell	Finley	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rupley
Barkley	Flood, Va.	Kirkpatrick	Saunders
Bartlett	Floyd, Ark.	Lazaro	Sims
Bell, Ga.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lee, Ga.	Sinnott
Blackmon	Garrett, Tex.	Lever	Sisson
Boomer	George	Lobeck	Smith, Idaho
Broussard	Gill	McGillcuddy	Smith, Saml. W.
Buchanan, Tex.	Godwin, N. C.	McKellar	Stedman
Burgess	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Greene, Vt.	Miller	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardwick	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy	Morgan, Okla.	Taylor, Colo.
Candler, Miss.	Hawley	Murray	Tribble
Cantrill	Heflin	Oldfield	Underwood
Caraway	Helvering	Padgett	Vaughan
Carlin	Henry	Page, N. C.	Walker
Carter	Hensley	Park	Watson
Collier	Houston	Pou	Webb
Crisp	Hughes, Ga.	Quin	Whaley
Curry	Hull	Ragsdale	Wingo
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Rayburn	Witherspoon
Dent	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly, Conn.	
Eagle	Jacoway	Rothermel	
Edwards	Johnson, Ky.	Rouse	

NAYS—72.

Alexander	Dixon	Kennedy, Conn.	Prouty
Ashbrook	Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey
Bailey	Doremus	Key, Ohio	Raker
Barnhart	Eagan	Kindel	Rauch
Barton	Edmonds	Koroly	Riordan
Beakes	Esch	Langham	Scott
Borchers	Fairchild	Leshar	Sherley
Borland	Fitzgerald	Lieb	Sherwood
Bruckner	Gardner	Lloyd	Stafford
Bulkley	Gilmore	Maguire, Nebr.	Stanley
Butler	Glass	Mahan	Stone
Coady	Goldfogle	Mapes	Tavener
Cox	Goulden	Metz	Thomson, Ill.
Cullop	Gray	Moore	Townsend
Dershem	Hamlin	Nelson	Tuttle
Dickinson	Hay	O'Leary	Underhill
Difenderfer	Hinds	Patten, N. Y.	Vate
Dillon	Holland	Patton, Pa.	White

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Fergusson	Kreider	Moon	Whitacre
Kinkaid, N. J.	Linthicum	Payne	

NOT VOTING—248.

Adair	Baltz	Brown, N. Y.	Calder
Alken	Barchfeld	Brown, W. Va.	Callaway
Ainey	Bartholdt	Browne, Wis.	Campbell
Allen	Bathrick	Browning	Cantor
Anderson	Beall, Tex.	Brumbaugh	Carew
Ansberry	Bell, Cal.	Bryan	Carr
Anthony	Bowdle	Buchanan, Ill.	Cary
Austin	Britton	Burke, Pa.	Casey
Avis	Brockson	Burke, S. Dak.	Chandler, N. Y.
Baker	Brodbeck	Burke, Wis.	Church

Clancy	Green, Iowa	Lindquist	Seldomridge
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Mass.	Loft	Sells
Claypool	Grogg	Logue	Shackelford
Cline	Griest	Loneragan	Shreve
Connelly, Kans.	Griffin	McAndrews	Slayden
Connolly, Iowa	Gudger	McClellan	Slemp
Conry	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Sloan
Cooper	Hamill	McKenzie	Small
Copley	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Cramton	Hamilton, N. Y.	MacDonald	Smith, Md.
Crosser	Hammond	Madden	Smith, Minn.
Dale	Harris	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Danforth	Harrison	Manahan	Smith, Tex.
Davenport	Hart	Martin	Sparkman
Decker	Haugen	Merritt	Steenerson
Deltrick	Hayden	Mitchell	Stephens, Cal.
Dies	Hayes	Mondell	Stephens, Nebr.
Donohoe	Helgesen	Morgan, La.	Stevens, Minn.
Dooling	Helm	Morin	Stevens, N. H.
Doolittle	Hill	Morrison	Stout
Doughton	Hinebaugh	Moss, Ind.	Stringer
Driscoll	Hobson	Moss, W. Va.	Summers
Drukker	Howard	Mott	Sutherland
Dunn	Howell	Mulkey	Switzer
Dupré	Hexworth	Murdoch	Taggart
Elder	Hughes, W. Va.	Neeley, Kans.	Talbott, Md.
Estopinal	Hullings	Noely, W. Va.	Talcott, N. Y.
Faison	Igoe	Nolan, J. I.	Taylor, Ala.
Farr	Johnson, Utah	Norton	Taylor, N. Y.
Ferris	Johnson, Wash.	O'Brien	Temple
Fess	Jones	Oglesby	Ten Eyck
Fields	Kahn	O'Hair	Thacher
FitzHenry	Keister	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Fordney	Kelley, Mich.	Paige, Mass.	Thompson, Okla.
Poster	Kelly, Pa.	Palmer	Townner
Fowler	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker	Treadway
Francis	Kent	Peters	Vollmer
Frear	Kettner	Peterson	Volstead
French	Kless, Pa.	Phelan	Wallin
Gallagher	Kitchin	Platt	Walsh
Gallivan	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley	Walters
Gard	Konop	Porter	Watkins
Garner	Lafferty	Post	Weaver
Gerry	La Follette	Powers	Williams
Gillett	Langley	Reed	Willis
Gittins	Lee, Pa.	Reilly, Wis.	Wilson, Fla.
Goeke	L'Engle	Roberts, Mass.	Wilson, N. Y.
Good	Lenroot	Roberts, Nev.	Winstow
Gordon	Levy	Rogers	Woodruff
Gorman	Lewis, Md.	Russell	Woods
Graham, Ill.	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath	Young, N. Dak.
Graham, Pa.	Lindbergh	Seuly	Young, Tex.

No quorum voting.

Mr. WHITACRE. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "nay." I have a general pair with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. RUSSELL, on the cotton question. I desire to inquire if I may withdraw my vote of "nay" on this question and answer "present"?

The SPEAKER. Yes; because this is the cotton question.

Mr. WHITACRE. And I desire to be recorded "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. WHITACRE, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. One hundred and seventy-nine Members have answered to their names on this roll, not a quorum.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of T. S. Williams; and

H. R. 4405. An act for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 21, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MULKEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4931) to prevent false advertising in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1194), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6867) to increase and fix the compensation of the collector of customs for the customs collection district of Omaha, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1195), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18430) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kirkpatrick, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19357) to release to production and to prevent monopoly of the coal and oil deposits in public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 19358) to amend an act of February 8, 1875, entitled "An act levying a tax of 10 per cent per annum on every person, firm, association, other than national-bank associations, and every corporation, State bank, or State banking association on the amount of their own notes used for circulation and paid out by them"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 19359) to increase the security of marine mortgages; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19360) to amend section 4196 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 19372) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sanford, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COADY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19373) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINDS: Resolution (H. Res. 653) authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay India M. Rich, widow of William H. Rich, a sum equal to six months' salary of her late husband, together with funeral expenses not exceeding \$250; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Resolution (H. Res. 654) providing for the consideration of S. 5614 and S. J. Res. 191; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Resolution (H. Res. 655) providing for the consideration of H. R. 17800; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 19361) granting a pension to Eliza Sturdevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 19362) for the relief of Thomas Amick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19363) for the relief of James Nolen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 19364) granting a pension to Jerome B. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19365) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus T. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19366) granting a pension to Charles O. Woerner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19367) granting an increase of pension to George Lichty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 19368) granting a pension to Henry S. Matter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 19369) granting a pension to Sarah E. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 19370) granting a pension to Amanda B. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 19371) to amend and correct the military record of Thomas Decker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 19374) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Powley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of the Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against tax on life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of George Gild, of St. Benedict; H. S. Cooney, of Cresson; and Louis Baumgardner, of Scalp Level, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of the J. G. Hupfel Brewing Co. and the David Steveson Bag Co., of New York, protesting against tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. Robitzek & Bro., S. Huppels Sons, and C. Rieger & Son, all of New York City, against increase of 25 cents in beer tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARR: Petitions of Charles Ratner, of Latrobe; J. W. Rummel, of Hollsopple; John Fogle, of Garrett; R. G. Smith, of Ligonier; James J. Friedline, of Bakersville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against proposed tax per horsepower on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of 115 citizens of Wyoming County, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of W. L. Rosenkrans and S. F. Lapiana, of Hoboken, N. J., against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eagle Brewing Co., of Newark, N. J., and the Hudson County (N. J.) Consumers' Brewing Co., against increase in tax on beer to 75 cents a barrel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Thomas J. O'Connell, of New York, relative to vaseline in revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Evangelical Lutheran Sunday School of San Jose, Cal., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of California, favoring House bill 5139, relative to retirement of Government clerks; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the San Mateo (Cal.) Typographical Union, favoring amendment to House bill 15902, relative to Government printing; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of sundry voters of Santa Barbara, Cal., favoring amendment to a bill to revise, etc., the laws relating to the public printing (H. R. 15905); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the Baptist Young People's Union of the Baptist Church of Brush Plains, Wash., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of Joseph Odermeyer and others, of New York, protesting against increase in tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George W. Lane & Co., of New York, favoring a tax on tea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph W. Stevens, mayor of the city of Albany, N. Y., relative to Government armor-plate plant at Breaker Island; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Federal Milling Co., of Lockport, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Moss grain bill (H. R. 17329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of the Gabel, Johnson & Harwood Brokerage Co. and the Reliable Credit Co., both of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against prohibiting sale of return envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of various business men of the first congressional district of Nebraska, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 4899, relative to standard barrel for fruit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the Pittsburgh Water Heater Co., protesting against House bill 17363, relating to use of the mails for securing insurance on persons, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petitions of the Hostetter Co. and the Western Pennsylvania Retail Druggists' Association, of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens and corporations of Pittsburgh, Pa., against proposed change in law as to printing of envelopes with return address stamped thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of the Pennsylvania Federation of Liquor Dealers, against tax on beer and liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Pennsylvania State Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the McGillicuddy bill, relative to compensation for letter carriers when sick; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens and corporations of Pittsburgh, Pa., against section 3 of House bill 18891; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Detroit Insulated Wire Co., protesting against war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor of Beardstown, Ill., and the Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church, of Jacksonville, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of various business men of White Hall, Ill., favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of 700 citizens of Crete, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Burke (Idaho) Miners' Union, favoring the passage of the Kern-Foster safety-appliance bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petitions of various retail druggists of Fargo, N. Dak., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of various druggists of North Dakota, protesting against war-revenue drug-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rolla and New Rockford (N. Dak.) Woman's Christian Temperance Unions protesting against revenue by taxing alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. H. Mattingly, of Jamestown, N. Dak., protesting against war tax on fire-insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lahr-Motor Sales Co., of Bismarck, N. Dak., and the North Dakota Automobile Dealers' Association, of Fargo, N. Dak., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, October 21, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we lift our hearts to Thee we remember that Thou art the holy one of Israel; that Thou art the God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the God of our fathers. Thy name has been held with reverence by those who laid the foundations of this great Government. Thy name has been heard in all the councils of our State. We praise Thee for the protection Thou hast given to us, for raising up men into places of leadership and power, and for the spirit that has animated all the deliberations of Thy people. We pray that Thou wilt guide us on, making us more and more an instrument in Thy hands for the establishment of Thy great kingdom in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

AMERICAN VESSELS AND WATCH OFFICERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, a list of vessels admitted to American registry under the act of August 18, 1914, with a statement of gross tonnage, when and where built, name of American owner, and former nationality, and so forth. The communication and accompanying statement will lie on the table and be printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 20, 1914.

The SECRETARY OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The department received on the 17th instant the following resolution of the Senate of the United States:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 8 (calendar day October 16), 1914.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be requested to furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, the following information:

First, How many Americans were shown by reports from the various customs districts to be available for watch officers, including masters,